38th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: (recording malfunction) "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. Members and our guests in the gallery are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford the pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Church here in Springfield."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Almighty and most gracious God, our heavenly creator who has dominion over life and death, I ask this day that You would grant to us grace to remember with love and reverence that we are to go forth in peace with courage holding fast of that which is good, rendering to no one evil for evil. But we ask that You would help us to strengthen the faintend hearted, help us to support the weak, help us to help the afflicted, help us to honor all people, loving and serving them with the same spirit and love in which You have loved us with. This we ask in Your Son's name. Amen."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mendoza, would you like to lead us in the Pledge?"
- Mendoza et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Hannig: "Roll Call... Roll Call for Attendance.

 Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Patterson is excused today."
- Speaker Hannig: "And Representative Bost."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Sommer is excused today."

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 116 Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, read the Committee Reports."

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Osterman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Amendment #1 to House Bill 1347. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Local Government, to which following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Amendment #3 to House Bill 20... 224, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3091. Representative Dugan, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 18, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is House Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 161 and House Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1235 and House Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3602. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 18, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is House Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3014. Representative Saviano, Chairperson from the Committee on Registration &

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

to which the following measure/s was/were Regulation, referred, action taken on April 18, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is House Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 128. Representative Holbrook, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment & Energy, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 18, 2007, reported following recommendation/s: same back with the 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill Representative Flowers, Chairperson from Committee on Health Care Availability & Access, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2242. Representative Scully, Chairperson from the Committee on Electric Utility Oversight, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 19, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is House Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2973; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is House Bill 1871. The following Resolutions are referred to the House Committee on Rules: House Resolution 300, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 301, offered by Representative Gordon. House Resolution 303, offered by Representative Mendoza. House Resolution 304, offered by Representative Fortner. House Resolution 306, offered by Representative Coulson. House Resolution 307, offered by Representative Fritchey."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brauer, for what reason do you rise?"

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "...point."

Brauer: "The Hope Institute of Children and Families has been serving the Springfield area and their children with multiple disabilities since 1957. Dr. Joe Nyre, president and CEO of Hope School, Jim Reed, Illinois Education Association is also a board member at Hope School and Laura Sandorlini is an instructor to the senior class at Hope School visiting the Capitol today. They're up here in the west gallery. Please give me a hand and give 'em a Springfield welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Welcome to Springfield. We're going to begin on the Order of Second Reading. And I've got a list of Bills that are on Second that are priority for the Members and we'll try to move down the list in alphabetical order as best we can. And so, Representative Bellock, you're first on the list with House Bill 2808. Do you wish us to read that Bill? On Second to Third? Read the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2808, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Bellock, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much. I move to adopt the Amendment."

38th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Boland, you have House Bill 1460. Would you like us to read that on Second?

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1460, a Bill for an Act concerning
 State Government has been read a second time, previously.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2
 was withdrawn. Floor Amendment #3, offered by
 Representative Boland, has been approved for consideration."

 Speaker Hannig: "Representative Boland."
- Boland: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 3... Amendment 3 what it does is changes the wording from fluorescent basically adds the... the words 'where practicable', which was suggested by one of the committee Members and uses Energy Star labeled light bulbs as defined by the Energy Star Program of the United States EPA."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Brady, you have House Bill 572. Out of the record. Representative Brauer, you have House Bill 1832. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1832, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No

38th Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Coladipietro on 3767. Out of the record. Representative Cole...

 Representative Cole on House Bill 1242. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1242, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Collins on House Bill 790. Out of the record. Representative Cross on House Bill 2858. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2858, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Cross, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Cross."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Amendment that becomes the Bill. This deals with an Internet safety package we have that's an Amendment that incorporates the recommendations of the committee. And I appreciate favorable consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Colvin, 1662.

 Out of the record. Representative D'Amico on 2749.

 Representative... Okay. So, that'll be out of the record.

38th Legislative Day

- Representative Monique Davis on 1359. Do you wish us to read this Bill on Second? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. House Bill 1359."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1359, a Bill for an Act concerning employment has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Monique Davis, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 1 merely changes the time period, I think, from five (5) years for filing a complaint, I think, to one (1) year. And it changes the ten (10)-year limitation, I believe, to five (5) years."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Dunkin on 1351.

 Out of the record. Represent... Representative... Oh,
 Representative... Representative... Why don't we go back to
 Representative Brady. You have House Bill 572. Mr. Clerk,
 would you read that Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 572, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

38th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Durkin on House Bill 448. Out of the record. Representative Flowers, 1759.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1759, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Flowers, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flowers on the Amendment."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman... Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 is an agreed to Amendment that makes minor changes. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions you have regarding the Amendment."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Ford, you have House Bill 980 on the Order of Second Reading. Do you wish us to advance that from Second to Third? Out of the record. How about House Bill 3602, Representative Ford? 3602 from Second to Third? Okay. So, Mr. Clerk, read that Bill, 3602."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3602, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Ford, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "On the Amendment, Representative Ford. Present the Amendment briefly, Representative Ford, and then we'll

38th Legislative Day

- adopt it. Out of the record. Representative Fritchey on House Bill 8. Do you wish us to read that on Second? No. Out of the record. Representative Hassert on House Bill 39. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 39, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Golar on House Bill 3653. Out of the record. Representative Gordon on House Bill 3588. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3588, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Graham on House Bill 415. Out of the record. Representative Granberg. Out of the record. Representative Hamos. Out of the record. Representative Harris on House Bill 147. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 147, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Amendment #2 was adopted on the floor. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Harris, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Harris."
- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Amendment #3 is an agreed Amendment clarifying who must establish the CPT or Common

38th Legislative Day

- Practice Terminology codes, that being a national responsibility not a state responsibility."
- Speaker Hannig: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. However, notes have been requested and not yet received."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, Representative Harris, the Bill has to remain on Second Reading until you can get the notes answered, so… so we'll hold it here for the time being. Representative Harris, you also have House Bill 1286. Do you wish us to read that Bill? Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1286, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Do you wish us to move it to Third? Okay. Third Reading. Representative Hernandez on House Bill 1641. Representative Hernandez, do you wish us to read 1641? Out of the record. Representative Hoffman on 2133. Out of the record. Representative Holbrook, you have House Bill 614. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 614, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

38th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Howard, you have House Bill 3627 on Second Reading? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3627, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. This Bill has been read a second time, previously.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Howard, has been approved for consideration."

 Speaker Hannig: "Representative Howard."
- Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #1 is an agreed Amendment between the Sponsors and others who were initially opposed. It provides that on the June 30 occurring in the third year after the transfer to these funds that the Treasurer would transfer the amount of one million dollars (\$1,000,000) from the Charitable Trust Fund to the General Revenue Fund. If, on that date, the amount is less than... than a million dollars (\$1,000,000), than the trans... the Treasurer would transfer the remaining balance of the fund, the General Fund, on each June 30 thereafter. I will, at this point..."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Howard: "I'll... I'll wait for questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. And Representative Howard, you also have House Bill 1639. Do you wish us to read that?

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

38th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1639, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Jefferson, you have House Bill 3428. Out of the record. Representative Krause, you have House Bill 2973. Representative Krause, 2973. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2973, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Krause, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Krause."
- Krause: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do ask for support. The Amendment provides for consumer education material to work with the Commerce Commission to advise residential and small businesses as to further steps that can be done for conservation in the area of utilities, particularly for electrical savings."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion on the Lady's Amendment? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lyons, you have House Bill 2304.

 Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, move House Bill 2973 to Third

 Reading. And Representative Lyons, you have House Bill

 2304. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

38th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2304, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative May... May, you have House Bill 684. Out of the record. Representative Mathias, you have House Bill 1327. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. 1327."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1327, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Excuse me. Representative McCarthy, you have House Bill 2632. Representative McCarthy, 2632. Representative McCarthy, 2632. Representative McCarthy, do you wish us to read this Bill? Okay. So, out of the record. And now, Representative Mendoza, you have House Bill 1635. Do you wish us to read that? It's on Second Reading and the question is, do you wish us to move it to Third? Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1635, a Bill for an Act concerning commerce. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Mendoza, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, Floor Amendment #1 has been approved for consideration, Representative, would you like to present it?"
- Mendoza: "Yeah, that's fine. Thank you, Mr. Chairman or Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1635 is a very straightforward Bill. It passed out of the

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Agriculture Committee unopposed. And basically, would ask that... it provides for..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative..."

Mendoza: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: "...we're on Amendment #1."

Mendoza: "Yes, the Amendment."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay."

Mendoza: "I think the Amendment simply is... hold on, let me get that... Now, you know what. Let me pull it out of the record. Sorry. I don't have the Amendment in front of me. Sorry. I'll get back to it."

Speaker Hannig: "You have also two other Bills, Representative, on the list. House Bill 1958. So, Mr. Clerk, read that Bill, please. I'm sorry, 1958."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1958, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Mendoza, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "On the Amendment, Representative Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment to House Bill 1958 is some cleanup language that I agreed to do in committee. Very simply, just clarifies some of the language where we removed the provision that deals with a twenty-five dollar (\$25) credit. That is no longer in the Bill, at the request of the committee. As well as clarifies what constitutes customer fault on the cell phone lemon laws. So, I don't think we should have any objection to this. I did it based on the committee's request and would just ask for your support."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. And Representative Mendoza, you have House Bill 2242. 2242. Do you wish us to read that on Second?

Mendoza: "Yeah."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2242, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Mendoza, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mendoza on..."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment necessitates the Department of Public Health to promulgate rules and regulations to include the pneumococcal conjugate vaccine with other six... routine childhood immunizations for children that are enrolled in state-licensed daycare centers. The pneumococcal vaccine... or the pneumococcal disease is responsible for the largest amount of deaths in children who are at the age of immunization. And we would appreciate that... I would anticipate that the Body would agree that we should probably do whatever we can to protect these children from diseases such as meningitis and other bacterial diseases that could prove to be fatal. Would ask for your approval."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any... is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Meyer, you have House Bill 3091. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3091, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Meyer, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. It amends the Illinois Municipal Code by providing that any municipality that does not previously impose a tax under the Home Rule Municipal Retailers Occupation Tax Act may raise a tax within a one mile area and not exceeding 2 percent on alcoholic beverages, soft drinks, and food prepared for immediate consumption. It provides that the ordinance must be adopted with the municipality, obtaining the written consent of at least three-fourths of the operators of the businesses upon which a tax shall be imposed and the proceeds of the tax will be used only for the cost associated with land acquisition, design, construction, and maintenance of parking facilities within the area. It has a sunset on it. And I move that this be adopted."

38th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Mitchell, Bill Mitchell, you have two Bills. House Bill 1983. Okay. Out of the record. We'll go to Representative Jerry Mitchell on House Bill 822. Out of the record. Representative Munson, you have House Bill 1235. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1235, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Munson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Munson on the Amendment.

 Explain the Amendment briefly and then we'll adopt it,

 Representative."
- Munson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment adds a penalty that was left out in the original drafting of the lang... language of the Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Lady's Amendment. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Myers on House Bill 290, Rich Myers. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

38th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 290, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Mendoza, we're going to go back to 1635. And Mr. Clerk, would you read that Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1635, a Bill for an Act concerning commerce. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Mendoza, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mendoza."
- Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment is very simple.

 All it does is include a definition and will constitutes
 'wood'. It defines 'wood' as whole logs, lumber, or any
 wood products that are made in whole or in part from any
 living or dead tree. Would ask for your support."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Jerry Mitchell, you have ous... House Bill 822. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 822, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative May, Karen May, you have House Bill 684. Do you wish us to read that Bill

38th Legislative Day

- on Second? Out of the record. Representative Nekritz, you have two Bills. House Bill 680. Would you like us to read that one? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 680, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Nekritz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amend... this is a Bill to create a... establish a feasibility study for a biomonitoring program in Illinois. And this Amendment is something that we've worked out with the Chemical Industry Council, so it's an agreed Amendment."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. And Representative Nekritz on 1421. Out of the record. Representative Poe, you have House Bill 3218. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3218, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Poe, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Poe."
- Poe: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is... basically what we're doin', requiring Internet

38th Legislative Day

- gaming service providers to provide a method for game cancellation. I'd ask for your approval."
- Speaker Hannig: "There any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Ramey on House Bill 472. Wish us to read 472? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 472, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Reboletti on House Bill 3662. Out of the record. Representative Reis on House Bill 3289. Out of the record. Representative Reitz on House Bill 282. Do you wish us to read that one? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 282, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Rose on House Bill 2036. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2036, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Ryg on House Bill 1717. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1717, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No

38th Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Schock, you have House Bill 699. Out of the record. Representative Smith, you have House Bill 1026. Out of the record. Representative Stephens, you have House Bill 617. That's out of the record. Representative Sullivan on House Bill 3165. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3165, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Sullivan, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative... Representative Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "What this Bill simply does is add the word 'human' before 'blood' to allow people that are under fifteen (15) to work at veterinary clinics. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "Does... Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Washington on House Bill 656. Do you wish us to read that? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 656 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

38th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Third Reading. And Representative Granberg, you have House Bill 3638. Is that correct? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3638, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Granberg, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 reflects an agreement between all the interested parties in the Bill.

 And I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Wyvetter Younge, you have House Bill 1580. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1580, a Bill for an Act concerning human services. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Younge, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Younge."
- Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 changes the time that the Department of Human Services has to complete a plan for substance abuse treatment among the homeless. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Lady's Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes'

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Cross, for what reason do you rise?"

Cross: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a point of personal privilege. I've... very lucky to have in my district a youth council made up of students from Plainfield and Oswego and Joliet and they have been down here the last two days learning about State Government. And I want to welcome them to the gallery, there up here behaving very well. Look at 'em; they're waving. So, thank you for acknowledging them, Mr. Speaker, and they've had a good couple days. So, thanks. Actually, they're right back here. Bye."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Golar, you have House Bill 3653. Do you wish us to read that Bill? You wish... to read the Bill? Hold the Bill. Okay. So, that's out of the record. How about House Bill 3383, Representative? Representative Golar, 3383. Do you wish us to read that Bill? From Second to Third? Out of the record. Okay. Representative Graham, you have House Bill 415. Did you wish us to read that Bill on Second? No. Okav. That's out of the record then. Representative Hamos on House Bill 742. You wish us to read that on Second Reading? Is that ready to go? Okay. So, out of the record. Representative Coladipietro, you have House Bill 3767 on Second. Okay. We'll keep it there then. Out of the record. Representative Cultra, you have House Bill 1736. Did you wish us to read that on Second? Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. Out of the record. Representative

38th Legislative Day

- Durkin on 448. Out of the record. Okay. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3383."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3383, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 587?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 587 is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Jefferson, you have House Bill 3428. Do you wish us to read that on Second Reading? From Second to Third? Do you wish us to read that on Second and move it to Third? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3428, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Jefferson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, Representative Jefferson, you're recognized on the Amendment."
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment certainly... it just clarifies the language as it relates to IDOT who had some concerns. With this Amendment, it clears up those concerns."
- Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Gentleman's introductory comments. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of

38th Legislative Day

- the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 742."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 742, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 has been approved for consideration. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 were referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, we'll hold that pending those... Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1557."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1557, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law, has been read a second time, previously.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

 All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. We're going to go to the Order of Third Readings for a while. And we'll try to follow the alphabet as best we can. And the first Bill that I have on the list is Representative Bradley, John Bradley, on House Bill 1775. Okay. So, that's out of the record. Rich Bradley on 1231. That's out of the record. Representative Bost, would you like for us to read 3618? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Clerk, read House Bill 3618."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3618, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3618 provides Bost: concealed carry... Oh, no, wait, that was yesterday. No, no, This one goes... it amends the... Flag Display Act and requires that the Governor to issue official notice of death of an Illinois resident killed by hostile fire or a member of the United States armed forces are killed in the line of duty as a law enforcement officer. Upon the notice, that the display of the United States Flag, the state Flag of Illinois, and the appropriate military flag at half-staff at each state, local, government facility required to be displayed the United States Flag, national flag, on flag... on a flagstaff. Requires the Department of Veterans' Affairs and Department of State Police to notify the Governor of... of the resident's death, effective immediately. Basically, under existing law, and I didn't realize this until I carried this Bill, only the President has that right. This gives it to the Governor. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flowers and Rita. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Coladipietro, you have House Bill 42. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 42, a Bill for an Act concerning sex offenders. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Coladipietro."
- Coladipietro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 42 amends the Sex Offender Community Notification Law. It provides that the State Police shall provide on its sex offender information Web page a form that allows a person who seeks to access sex offender information to be notified by e-mail when an offender changes residence, employment, or school attendance to a location within a particular zip code or within a certain distance from their address. Provides the State Police should provide information by e-mail notification to the person who completes this form. This Bill's supported by the Illinois Association of Park Districts. And I'd ask for your support."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Joyce, for what reason do you rise?"

Joyce: "Thank... Inquiry of the Chair. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your inquiry."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Joyce: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could you give us some... are we still going alphabetical order here?"

Speaker Hannig: "I'm doing my best, Representative."

Joyce: "Well, I didn't... I didn't... I was just wondering what the..."

Speaker Hannig: "Yeah."

Joyce: "...process was here. You know, we left off at..."

Speaker Hannig: "So..."

Joyce: "...at the... at the beginning of the Js yesterday, just for your information."

- Speaker Hannig: "Well, we're up to the Fs... F right now, so Representative Feigenholtz is next. So, we're movin' right along. Representative Feigenholtz, you have House Bill 652. Okay. So, we'll move... move to Representative Flowers on House Bill 192. Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't you, Sara. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 652."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 652, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 652, which many of the Members are cosponsors of, is a piece of legislation that further improves the Community Care Program by creating more flexibility in the program for seniors who are wanting to stay home prior to unnecessary institutionalization. We worked hard with the department and we have an agreement on this Bill. And I'd be glad to answer any questions."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor... Excuse me. Is there discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'... Oh, pardon me. Ramey, Representative Ramey, did you wish to ask a question?"

Ramey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry. We were just discussing the Bill here."

Speaker Hannig: "Yeah."

Ramey: "Representative... Will she yield to a question?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Ramey: "Can you explain the Bill to us, please?"

Feigenholtz: "Certainly, I'd be glad to. Currently... last year we raised the asset limit in the Community Care Program from ten thousand (\$10,000) to 17.5 thousand dollars (\$17,500) and we... we, as in a lot of Members of the Appropriations Committee and people who are concerned about seniors who have limited choices in the Community Care Program, have been working to enhance this program. Essentially, what this Bill does is expand the program so that it's... it's more reflective of the personal assistance program in the DORS There are... so that seniors have more flexible budget. hours. That... and there's been discussion about having these seniors being able to choose who their caregiver is to get adequate training. There's an element in it that will maximize federal participation for Community Care participants in the program so that more seniors can participate."

Ramey: "Thank you. Is this the Bill where you talked about where they could hire their family members?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Ramey: "And did we get any training for those family members?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry. I can't hear you."

Ramey: "Any training for those family members?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes. Yes. Absolutely. There's training and oversight. There was a lot of discussion about that. And I know that one of the things we were trying to avoid, as I think you and I discussed, is we don't want the department to have to employ additional people on an ombudsmans program. We're trying to avert fraud and deception and we felt that the best way to do that would be to have the providers do that training and oversight."

Ramey: "Do you have a better answer to my question from the committee today, which was, don't they do it for free, family members?"

Feigenholtz: "You know, I'm not sure I can answer that question clearly."

Ramey: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "We'll put this on the Order of Standard Debate.

And Representative Mulligan, you're recognized for 5
minutes."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Mulligan: "Representative, where was this Bill discussed, which committee?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry, Rosemary."

Mulligan: "Which committee was this Bill sent through? Where was..."

Feigenholtz: "It did... it went to Aging."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Mulligan: "It went to Aging. Is AARP in favor of this Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes, they are. They helped draft it."

Mulligan: "Some things are deleted here. What services, under your Bill, will no longer be the same and what will replace them?"

- Feigenholtz: "I don't think that we removed any services,

 Representative Mulligan. Are you talking about services
 that were removed from the original Bill?"
- Mulligan: "I... That could be. And I'm not looking at our... our staff's analysis. I'm looking at the status of the Bill and it says, 'deletes home health services and home nursing services from the program, includes personal assistant services, flexible senior services, Medicaid management and emergency home response in the program.' So..."
- Feigenholtz: "These were already... You know, if you took a look at the Aging budget this year, you'll notice that there had been some changes in the budget because last year the Department of Aging got an infusion of money and we worked around the Community Care portion of their budget so that they would have more flexibility. Included in that were home services programs and other elements that seniors were actually requesting. That we're allowing the CCP money to go farther so that clients could essentially, along with their case coordination units, have more services that were more appropriate for them."
- Mulligan: "All right. So, just to get back to the original part of my thought on this is, what does this change that will no longer be available besides what you've added? Is there… are there any significant changes that..."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Feigenholtz: "Nothing is eliminated."
Mulligan: "So, nothing's eliminated."

Feigenholtz: "No."

Mulligan: "There are no services that are..."

Feigenholtz: "No, ser... No, no, no. This is really more of trying to make this a more client-driven, flexible program that the case coordination units can use, so that they can better determine the needs of an individual in the program."

Mulligan: "All right. So, has anyone signed in against this Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "No."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Representative Feigenholtz, you're recognized to close."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

This is a continued effort to try and give Illinois seniors an opportunity to stay in their homes and age in place. I appreciate all the work that we did with the Jane Addams Senior Caucus who has brought this issue to the General Assembly, as well as AARP and the providers who participate in this program and work with the homemakers. I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

hereby declared passed. Representative Durkin, for what reason do you rise?"

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have a point of personal privilege?"

Speaker Hannig: "Proceed."

Durkin: "Thank you. I am a proud graduate of Fenwick High School in Oak Park, Illinois, class of '79. And it is my pleasure to introduce the 2007 AA Girls Champions Fenwick High School. They're in the Speaker's gallery. If we could all give them a round of applause and give them a warm, Springfield welcome. Also, joined by Senator Dan Cronin who's a Fenwick graduate. Principal Jim Quaid is with us and the coach Dave Power, who is the winningest coach in the high school girls' basketball history. The girls finished this year with a 29 and 2 record. And I want to emphasize that they defeated Representative Hassert's Bolingbrook in the state championship. But... but these are fantastic girls. They truly personify the... the student athlete. I... I can say with total conviction that I played basketball at Fenwick in the late '70s and I could not play on this team. They are that good. They're great girls. Some of 'em are playing at Notre Dame; they're going to Ohio State, University of Pennsylvania, Illinois Wesleyan. They are true student athletes. And it's an honor to have them here today and I wish them well. And thank you for joining us."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, for what reason do you rise? The Gentleman does not seek recognition. So, back on the Order of Third Reading. Representative Flowers, you have House Bill 192. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 192, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I bring to you House Bill 192 for the recommendation of the Association for Professionalism in Infection Control and Epidemiology. House Bill 192 would improve infection and control practices in all health care facilities and address the significant problems of community acquired infections. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions you have in regards to House Bill 192."

"This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Acevedo and Black, do you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Fritchey, you have House Bill 317. Out of the record. Representative Hernandez on House Bill 1072. Out of the record. Representative Hoffman on 1911. Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Representative Jakobsson on House Bill 313. Out of the Representative Jefferies, House Bill Representative Jefferies, do you wish us to read House Bill 949 on Third Reading? Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 949, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Jefferies."

Jefferies: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Today I'm presenting House Bill 494 (sic-949) and House Bill 494 (sic-949) would increase the TANF grant amount and effective as of June 30 by 15 percent. This particular Bill will help families in need and as the cost of living goes up, it is deserving. Okay. Those families that receive TANF funds must develop a plan for becoming self-sufficient and follow so it is not... this is not a limitless handout. So, I have... you have any questions, I will entertain them."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House Bill 949. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Black: "Representative, the Department of Human Services, which is obviously under the control of the Democrat administration, opposes the Bill. Why... You weren't able to work anything out with them. You're a Member of the Majority Party and that the Department of Human Services, the director is appointed by Governor Blagojevich, is opposed to your Bill. Why did they oppose the Bill?"

Jefferies: "That was for fiscal reasons."

Black: "So, they opposed it on the basis of money. This administration is opposing something on the basis of money? Whe... when did that start? What did the department say the end..."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Jefferies: "Because... because that is not... it's not in his budget."

Black: "Oh, it's not in the budget."

Jefferies: "No."

Black: "How much would it cost?"

Jefferies: "It would all cost approximately twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000)."

Black: "Twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000). Okay. Thank you very much, Representative. Appreciate your... your forthright answers. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

"Here's a Bill that... that certainly... probably has a genuine genesis. One... one could make a strong case that these amounts need to be increased, but I was under the impression that the Governor's budget message of two (2) or three (3) years ago, if we proposed something like this that adds twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) to a departmental budget, we also had to identify where we were going to get the money. Now, that's what the Governor said; it isn't what I said, it's what the Governor said. This Bill is not subject to appropriation. If ... if this Bill should become law, the Department of Human Services has to come up with twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) that the Lady, in... in her honesty which I appreciate, clearly has stated the department does not have the money. It is not budgeted. So, something has to give. Either twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) of services that were proposed in the Governor's budget will be removed or they'll have to find a way to find twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000). And I

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

think this budget is going to be rather tight regardless of how it turns out. So, I... I stand in reluctant opposition to the Lady's Bill simply because it identifies an absolute cost of twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) and does not identify any way to pay for it, which I find in direct contradiction to what the Governor said a couple of years ago in his budget address, if you're going to send me a Bill that costs money, you're going to have to send me how you're going to pay for it. This Bill doesn't do that. I don't think the twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) will appear in the budget negotiations and even though the Bill certainly is not without merit, it has merit, but, I can't in good conscience vote for a twenty million dollar (\$20,000,000) expenditure that is not part of the Governor's budget and I simply have no idea how you would find the twenty million (20,000,000). I intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gen... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Lang: "Representative, I just want to get this straight.

There's been some conjecture over here. Is this your first
Bill?"

Jefferies: "Yes, it is."

Lang: "And did you write this Bill yourself, Representative?"

Jefferies: "Did I... No, I did not write the Bill. I made some diversions to it."

Lang: "What... what changes did you make in it, Representative?" Jefferies: "Well, the date."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Lang: "I'm... I'm sorry? You changed the date?"

Jefferies: "Right. It was a technical recovery that I made."

Lang: "So... so, somebody came to you with this Bill. Is that correct? Hello?"

Jefferies: "Well, this Bill, even though I didn't... the process of going through my district and the ones in the State of Illinois who are under this program, I felt that with the cost of living and they have not had this increase since 1994. There was a 5 percent increase in 205 (sic-2005). And it's well below the poverty level for these people to sustain a decent living."

Lang: "So, did that answer my question about who drafted the Bill?"

Jefferies: "Okay. I have the Sargent Shriver Poverty Law Center is one, the Heartland Alliance is another."

Lang: "So, they're pretty good at what they do, aren't they?"

Jefferies: "Yes, they are."

Lang: "So, why... why did... why did the Bill originally have a date of June 3 as the date to be used and you changed it to June 30. What was that date change business all about?"

Jefferies: "That was a drafting error."

Lang: "Oh, it was a drafting error."

Jefferies: "Yes."

Lang: "Which, of course, is somebody else's fault 'cause you didn't draft the Bill, right?"

Jefferies: "Not the original."

Lang: "Ah, okay. So, what... Do you have some breakdown, Representative, as to how this affects each of those district by district?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Jefferies: "No, I do not."

Lang: "Don't you think... I know you're a freshman and all that,

Representative... don't you think it might be a good idea if

you took this Bill out of the record and provided all that

to us? You can say 'no' if you want."

Jefferies: "I do not."

Lang: "I'm sorry?"

Jefferies: "No, I do not."

Lang: "Okay. I just wanted to know what ya thought. I just...
just an idle question. Is there anything else you think we
should know about this Bill ya haven't told us already? Ya
got to a lot of staff hangin' around you over there,
Representative."

Jefferies: "Well, I can tell you... Okay. The average TANF cash grant statewide is two hundred and fifty-three dollars (\$253) a month. That's approximately thirty-seven thousand (37,000) families that receive TANF monthly. Approximately ninety-one thousand (91,000) persons receive TANF monthly with 79 percent of those being children. More than 45 percent of families receiving TANF have just one child, 29 percent have two children. Families with four or more children represent about 11 percent of all families on TANF. More than 57 percent of TANF cases include children the age of under six."

Lang: "Thank you, I think, Representative. So, under the Bill, a person could be homeless and still qualify. Is that correct?"

Jefferies: "Would you repeat that, please?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Lang: "Under the Bill, as I read it, a person could be homeless and still qualify. Is that correct?"

Jefferies: "They would have to have a dependent at home."

Lang: "Right."

Jefferies: "It's for women and children."

Lang: "Well, then, if they can have a dependent at home, how can they be homeless?"

Jefferies: "They wouldn't necessarily be homeless."

Lang: "But they could be homeless, if I'm reading the Bill correctly. Our analysis says that a person could be homeless and get these benefits, so I'm just trying to make sure that's correct."

Jefferies: "Okay. There has to be a residency... you have to have a residence somewhere where they have a mailing address."

Lang: "So, our... our staff analysis has an error in it?"

Jefferies: "Well, it could."

Lang: "Yeah. I think it could, also. Representative, I've completed my question. Thank you very much for putting up with me."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then Representative... Pardon me. Representative Jefferies, you're recognized to close."

Jefferies: "I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 949 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open.
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
who wish? Representative Mitchell, Beaubien, Cultra, do you
wish to be recorded? Last chance. Have all voted who wish?

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there 96 voting 'yes' and 17 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Monique Davis, for what reason do you rise?"
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Hannig: "State your point."
- Davis, M.: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to introduce to you a very good friend and an excellent educator. She is Mrs. Clarice Berry, the president of the Chicago Principals Administration Association. She's in the balcony up to my left. Clarice. Mr. Speaker, we also would like to introduce Faye Terrell-Perkins who is the senior executive director of CLASS who is an organization that does principal training and we're looking for principals similar to these two women in the balcony. Would you stand, Ms. Perkins. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jefferson, you have House Bill 362. Would you like us to read that Bill on Third? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 362, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jefferson."
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Secretary of State's Bill... I'm sorry. I'm going to figure out where I'm at. This is a Secretary of State's Bill that we ran last year and passed out of the House almost unanimously. And what it does is it penalizes

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

individuals for implying that they are past veterans when in fact they're not. We had a situation up in the… in my area where they caught a young… a gentleman displaying military plates as a veteran and he was, in fact, not a veteran. So, this just puts the penalties in place to address those situations. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

"This is on the Order of Short Debate. Speaker Hannig: anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 'no'. And this Bill, having voting received a Majority, is Constitutional hereby declared Representative Joyce, you have House Bill 1888. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1888, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Joyce."

Joyce: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1888 deals with qualified solid waste energy facilities and deals, in particular, with the Retail Rate Law. And what it simply states is that if a unit of government allow... purchases electricity and... from a utility company in which a qualified waste energy... solid waste energy facility is located, but does not purchase that utility... does not purchase that energy from the utility company that is the qualified solid waste energy facility then the amount paid would reflect what they would have paid

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

under the Retail Rate Law to the qualified solid waste energy facility. Methane gas plants that are generated from... that generate electricity from methane gas is the oldest and most... greatest amount of renewable energy that is... that is produced in the State of Illinois. I'd be happy to answer any questions. This just insures that that will continue. That those process for the existing plants will continue to take place for years to come."

"This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does Speaker Hannig: anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr... Representative Rose and Reboletti, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Joyce, you have House Bill 1727. You want to return that to Second? Okay. So, Mr. Clerk, return House Bill 1727 to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Lang, you have House Bill 3762. Do you wish us to read that on Third Reading? Okay. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Miller, you have House Bill 1497. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1497, a Bill for an Act concerning urban development. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Miller."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The House Bill 1497 creates the Illinois Urban Development Authority similar to other Development Authorities across the state. It is comprised of various members appointed by the Governor, mayor... president of Cook County... president of the Board of Cook County, the Governor and mayor of Chicago, among other members. It has the ability for communities of lower income, below the poverty level, to come together to initiate projects on their behalf in their... to try to improve their communities. I ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Biggins, Lyons, Osterman, Rose. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Moffitt, you have House Bill 2918. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2918, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2918 extends the life of two TIF districts in the City of Galesburg. This is in the statute that originally it's twenty-three (23) years and then you

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

can add another twelve (12). This is at the request of the City of Galesburg. I would like to mention that one of the TIF districts will allow for expansion of redevelopment efforts in the larger area of downtown Galesburg. And the other one would allow for expansion for the city to provide funding to the National Railroad Hall of Fame. An act of Congress has designated Galesburg as the site for the National Railroad Hall of Fame. I have the letters of support from the local taxing bodies. Be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Schock and Hoffman, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mulligan, you have House Bill 1539. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1539, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1539 amends the vet care program so that it outlines what can be done with lotto money from the veterans' lotto. Originally, there were five issues in it and through JCAR some of those things were changed. And so, we felt that we needed legislation to

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

actually define how much of the money could be spent on certain programs then the new director of Veterans', Tammy Duckworth, came to me with an Amendment that I accepted. And so, now what the Bill does is says that no more than 20 percent of the Veterans' Assistance Fund is allowed to be spent on health insurance for veterans. The rest of the money for that will be given out in grants created by a three-member board that we've done legislatively as opposed to rule and the allocation of the money will be done by grants through that board. All members are to be appointed to the board by the director of Veterans' Affairs. One member must be a member of the Veterans' Advisory Council and will be a voting member and every decision to allocate monies must be approved by a two-third vote and approved by the director of Veterans' Affairs."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Black: "Representative, unless I misinterpret what these can be used for, with long-term care could that money be spent on some of the veterans' homes that we have in Illinois? We have a backlog, a waiting list if you will, of over three hundred (300) people and yet we have almost two hundred (200) empty beds because the... this administration has chosen not to give the five (5) veterans' homes in Illinois enough money to hire staff to fill the beds. I have three (3)

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

veterans in my district who would be well-served by... by being admitted to a veterans' home, but the waiting list is so long that they'll probably unfortunately die before they get in."

Mulligan: "Yes. Some of the money could be used for that, particularly if they did a grant or it could be used if a local veterans' organization wanted to do something in order to help people get health care. Originally, when the Bill was passed, there were five areas that the lotto money would go to: it was veterans' post traumatic stress disorder, homelessness, the health insurance plan, disability benefits, and long-term care of veterans. And now, the only issue in the Bill is that only 20 percent of the money could go to the veterans' health insurance. The rest would be allocated by grant according to what the department wanted to do with it as opposed to the Governor directing all the money into the health care plan."

Black: "All right. I'm not sure I understand what the line item is on veterans' health care. Does that go to the Department of Veterans' Affairs or..."

Mulligan: "That comes through Human Services under the... under Veterans' Affairs, but it comes through that particular area for health care and nursing homes, comes through the Human Service budget for veterans. And they are... there's a whole discrepancy over what's going on and how the money's being used because the Governor has removed money from the fund and it seems to me there are a couple of different issues: lack of nurses, lack of slots being paid for, lack of money in the line items that would increase those. So I think what

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

happened with the lotto is it's supposed to be an expansion of money. Well, there's very interesting things going on with that lotto program right now."

Black: "See... the Governor has removed money from this Veterans' Fund. You mean, he has swept it or..."

Mulligan: "Yes."

Black: "He's taken money away from veterans, what did he do with it?"

Mulligan: "I think they went to GRF, if I'm not mistaken."

Black: "I just... I just find that... that's incredulous. When... when a... during a period of time when the number of veterans needing care is increasing, they're taking money out of the Veterans' Fund and spending it on paper clips and staplers, and God knows what. We have veterans' homes throughout the State of Illinois with empty beds because we don't have the money to staff the veterans' homes and we have a huge waiting list. I'm just incredulous that this has happened. Can you give me some reasonable assurance that this Bill may stop this kind of chicanery where we pass something to help veterans and it ends up not really being its primary cause?"

Mulligan: "Well, actually, Representative, this Bill doesn't address that particular issue but what it does address is the way the... the money from the lotto game that's supposed to go to veterans would be expended. Because the rules went through JCAR and there was some concern from JCAR Members over how all the money instead of being going... going to the five areas would all go to the separate veterans' plan which, by the way, they've only signed up thirty-three (33) people for. There was some concern and the department... the...

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

then department came... head of the department came back with a rule that kinda blocked us from having any say in it. So, what this does, under the new director who has gone along with what we were trying to do, is it limits the money from the lotto to only 20 percent going to the Veterans' Fund and the rest going to grants so that your local people could apply so the nursing homes could apply so, anybody could apply for. Unfortunately, I don't think that'll be a tremendous amount of money, but it's some money."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much for your efforts."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then Representative Mulligan, you're recognized to close."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would urge an 'aye' vote. This rectifies an oversight in the original legislation in determining how it... the money from the lotto would be spent, allowing it to go to rule which the bipartisan committee, Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, was not necessarily in favor with and the Amendment that was accepted was put forth by the director, Tammy Duckworth. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1539 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open.
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this
question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And
this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is
hereby declared passed. Representative Mitchell, for what
reason do you rise?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in my final year as superintendent of Dixon, I had the fortunate event happen that we passed a referendum built a middle school addition, which relieved overcrowding in all of our schools. That brings us to today. Today, the winner of the poster contest sponsored by the Illinois State Board of Education in coordination with the Illinois Alliance for Arts Education and the office of Governor Blagojevich, the winner of that contest was Jacob Corning a 12-year-old sixth grader at Reagan Middle School in Dixon. Jacob... he was chosen the winner of the statewide contest celebrating the 2007 Illinois Arts Education Week. Jacob's entry included five (5) cats drawn in ancient Egyptian style. I'm very proud to announce and to my right in the gallery is Jacob and his mother and dad, Doug and Tracey Corning, as the winner and here is the poster. Please give him a big round of applause. He did a super job. Thank you, Jacob. Thank you, Doug. Thank you, Tracey."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Munson, you have House Bill 1979. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1979, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Munson."

Munson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 79 (sic-1979) as amended creates a new

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

offense of luring a minor. With the increasing number of children using electronic communications on a day-to-day basis. It's important that we recognize dangers that are present. Kids are using text messaging, instant messaging, e-mail, they're on social networking sites like MySpace and Facebook and they really are at risk as sexual predators are making their... masking their identities and using Internet to lure our children into dangerous situations. They're skirting current laws by enticing children to meet with them to ensure they are not members of law enforcement. The purpose of this legislation is to better protect our children from these types of threats. House Bill 1979 differentiates between offenders who are twenty-one (21) years and older and those who are eighteen (18) to twenty (20) years old creating a higher standard for youthful offenders. It also adjusts the penalties based on the age of the offender. Luring a minor occurs when a stranger knowingly contacts or communicates electronically with the youth offender who is under the age of fifteen (15) years old with the intent to lure that minor from their home or from another location. I will take any questions. And ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Standard Debate. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Fritchey: "Representative, I happen to be in committee the one day that when you were presenting this Bill. About a decade

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

ago I had passed legislation creating the offense of solicitation of minor via the Internet for purposes. You're seeking to ... you're seeking to criminalize luring a minor from their home... I guess I'm looking at subsection 3, which is Amendment 2, for an 'unlawful purpose'. This is... it's a much broader departure than what we had done before. You have the law on the books now says that, you know, if you use electronic means to lure a minor in furtherance of the intention or the commission of a sexual offense, et cetera. You're now going to do it for any unlawful purpose and I'm wondering if, despite the best of intentions, that you might not be casting a net that is too wide. For example, and I'm going to try to come up with an example on the fly, but let's say that you have an adult... let's say you... you have a 19-year-old that IMs a 17-year-old friend and says, hey, come over to my house, we're going to go down to 7-Eleven and go get a six-pack of beer and sit in the park and drink some beer. Well, the minor drinking beer is an unlawful purpose. Is this the type of thing that we want to charge a 19-year-old with luring a minor?"

Munson: "There's a number of other factors that come into play.

The individual has to be a stranger so there cannot be any other..."

Fritchey: "Has to be a stranger to the parents."

Munson: "It has to be a stranger."

Fritchey: "A stranger to the parents."

Munson: "A stranger to the parents."

Fritchey: "I... I am a parent and many of us... I know a lot of my daughter's friends; I don't know all of them. And again,

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

and staff is smiling, he knows me too well here. I'm not trying to derail a well-intentioned idea here. But, if we're talking about luring a minor for any unlawful purpose and I... listen, I can... I can see in the Amendment, you put a lot of work into address the concerns that I heard the Jud II Committee bring up at the time and I appreciate you doing But what... the problems that we're reading about in the paper, the problems that we're seeing on the news, the problems that are unfortunately occurring are the use of social sites, are the use of the Internet to set up a rendezvous with a minor for a sexual encounter or whatever it may be. But any unlawful purpose, this presents a very, very heavy hammer to be used by prosecutors in what might not be a very heavy case. Again, the friend contacting the other friend to go get a six-pack of beer, I'm in no way condoning the consumption of alcohol by minors, but that would subject this person to criminal penalties under this Act."

Munson: "Our discussion with the State's Attorneys Office who helped craft this language, you know, indicated that they would be using discretion in using this. But they need this tool to catch predators who are out there who..."

Fritchey: "Representative, I agree with you entirely. This is not a predator Bill. It's... it's not... You have worked on, I have worked on, you and I together have worked on and a number of people in here some very, very good legislation to give law enforcement all the tools that they need to go after some very heinous offenders. This is not a predator Bill. This could be something as innocuous as come pick,

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

you know, I'm going to come pick you up. We're going to go take a ride. You know, we have laws now about how many kids can be the car when one of them is still on a restricted driver's permit. So, if the law is you and one friend and they IM you and say, come on, we're all going to go over to the football game and we're going to pick you up and we're going to have four minors in the car. Technically, that is luring a minor away for an unlawful purpose. Representative, can I ask you... can I ask you a sincere question, if you were to indulge me? Okay. I think we may be able... I promise I will work with you to get this problem right. Can ya take it out for a second so we can talk about this? Do you mind?"

Munson: "Yes, I'll take it out."

Fritchey: "I would appreciate it. Thank you."

Munson: "Thanks."

Speaker Hannig: "We'll take... we'll take this out of the record for the moment, come back to it at a later time. Representative Myers, you have House Bill 291. Excuse me. Representative Rose, for what reason do you rise?"

Rose: "Mr. Speaker, can I make a quick point of personal privilege?"

Speaker Hannig: "Certainly."

Rose: "It's off. There ya go. Ladies and Gentlemen, in the gallery behind me you have the young men and women, the Mattoon Junior ROTC. I've been to visit them a number of times and there are no finer individuals that come out of Mattoon Junior ROTC program. Many of them go on to serve in our military; many of them go on to college; many of them go

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- on to all kinds of wonderful things, but they're absolutely outstanding in their own individual ways. So, could we please join the Mattoon ROTC and give them a big welcome."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Myers on House Bill 291. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 291, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, I think the Clerk is telling me that there's an Amendment that's pending, so you want to move this back to Second at this time?"
- Myers: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move this Bill back to Second Reading..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay."
- Myers: "...for the purpose of an Amendment."
- Speaker Hannig: "Oh, so, we'll do that. Okay. So, Mr. Clerk, do we have the Amendment?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Myers, has been approved for consideration to House Bill 291."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, on the Amendment, Representative Myers."
- Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 improves the Bill, actually, by adding some additional categories to that which would be covered by the Department of Children and Family Services under their guardianship. It's supported by the Cook County Public Defender's Office and the Illinois State's Attorneys Association as well as the Illinois State Bar Association and Juvenile Justice Initiative."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. And we'll just hold it here for a while, Representative, but we'll get back to it at some point. Representative Osmond, you have House Bill 263. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 263, a Bill for an Act concerning sex offenders. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Osmond."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. I bring forth for your consideration today House Bill 263, which Representative Eddy and I have supported in an effort to address the sex offender voting in a school. This Bill amends the Election Code and provides that when a polling place is held within a school, the elector is unable to enter the school to vote because the elector is a child sex offender. The elector may vote early or by absentee. Requires that the election authority designate a permanent or temporary early voting polling place, must be designated at least, one, that a child sex offender may lawfully enter. This Bill also amends the Criminal Code of 1961 provides that it is a Class IV felony for a sex offender to knowingly be present within a hundred (100) feet of the site posted as a pickup or discharge stop for school transportation of students. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And on that question, the Lady from Grundy, Representative Gordon."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will."

Gordon: "Representative, is there a notice requirement? I mean, how are they going to know?"

Osmond: "I'm sorry. I was..."

Gordon: "How are they going to know who's a sex offender in that precinct? I mean, are the clerks... Is it their responsibility to look it all up and find out so that they know if the person comes into the school on Election Day that they can have them arrested? I mean, what's the notice?"

Osmond: "A sex offender has to register before entering a school."

Gordon: "So, they would be... So, if they came in on Election Day and the school was the polling place, it would be up to the sex offender to... to register at the school before they walked in?"

Osmond: "That's correct."

Gordon: "Okay. So, what if they don't do it? Let's just say they happen to break the law, which is why they're convicted in the first place, they walk in... no, no, no... they walk in, they vote on Election Day, what... I mean, they would be..."

Osmond: "I believe there's a criminal penalty."

Gordon: "It's a criminal penalty, but what about their vote?"

Osmond: "Well, that's why what..."

Gordon: "Does it count?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Osmond: "I mean, that's the whole purpose of this to make it so that they don't have this problem about entering the school so that they have an alternative to be able to vote."
- Gordon: "Is there any question that constitutionality of we're putting certain restrictions on a class of people that they can't vote in certain ways, on certain days? Is there enough of an openness to it that we're not concerned about that or is there... this too much of a restriction? Has there been anything that looked into that at all?"
- Osmond: "Well, it's not taking away the right to vote; it's just where they're voting."
- Gordon: "It's restricting their... their place that they can vote and when they can vote. Is that correct?"
- Osmond: "Well, we also restrict where they can live also."
- Gordon: "I understand that, but we're talking about voting and that's a constitutional situation here. Okay. We have... we have both U.S. and state. And so, is this too restrictive from a constitutional basis that it's going to get tossed out? Has there been any research by your staff into that specific question?"
- Osmond: "Well, first of all, there's a Class IV felony if a registered sex offender goes into a school. So, again, they would be breaking the law. I don't know of any constitutional test on this. I... I'm not familiar with that. My soul purpose in this is to trying to protect the children in the school, number 1. And number 2, not taking away the right of an individual who has been convicted as a sex offender the right to vote. So, we're just trying to cure the two areas."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Gordon: "Okay. And... and Representative, I guess, if they... if they do violate this law, if that does occur, in the end does the vote still count or is that part of the penalty that their ballot gets thrown out as well?"

Osmond: "The vote still counts, yes."

Gordon: "Okay. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentleman..."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Gordon: "...this is a very slippery slope. In... in the situation that we have I understand that sex offenders are dangerous. I understand that we want to protect our children from these offenders. We want to protect them from coming into a school. But when you approach the constitutional right to vote and to potentially restrict that right, it's questionable. And this may not pass constitutional muster because of that. Please choose very, very carefully when you make this vote because when we are stepping on someone's right, their constitutional rights to vote, it becomes very, very dangerous. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "We're going to put this on the Order of Standard Debate to accommodate some of our Members. Representative Black, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates..."

Black: "Representative, as I read your legislation, you are not denying any convicted sex offender the right to vote, are you?"

Osmond: "That's correct."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Black: "Your Bill clearly states that they can do early voting at one of the satellite offices or they can vote absentee, correct?"

Osmond: "That's correct. Yes, Sir."

Black: "Well, then I... I don't... I don't see any slippery slope.

Existing law does not allow a convicted sex offender to be within so many feet of a school and certainly doesn't allow a convicted sex offender to be in the school, correct?"

Osmond: "Yes, Sir."

"So, all you're doing is clarifying current law. Black: doesn't make any difference what the sex offender wants to go to the school for, under current law, he's not allowed to go, period. And the Bill clearly establishes the offender's right to vote by either absentee or early voting. I assume that all of you or most of you and most of us took advantage early voting or absentee voting since during the municipal election, held Tuesday, we were down here. So, I... I don't view it as a slippery slope. In all due respect to the previous speaker, it ... it clearly allows and outlines how that sex offender can and should be able to vote, but simply makes it clear that under existing law the sex offender is not supposed to be in the school if, in fact, the school is the polling place. I... I think it's a reasonable law that simply clarifies existing law and makes certain that there are options for that convicted sex offender to exercise their right to vote. I would encourage an 'aye' vote on the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Dunkin: "Thank you. You know, Representative, where is she? There she is. Hi, Representative. You know, this Bill, you know, it's very difficult for Legislators, responsible Legislators, to vote against issues of sex offenders, in this matter and other matters that we've addressed over the years. And it seems as if a lot of us tend to find issues along this sex offender line, some of us, maybe because it's popular in our district or in the state and we really want to have an impact, the other part, and I agree, we should have a major impact as it relates to individuals who prey on kids. I have three kids myself and so the last thing that I want to experience is having someone remotely close to offending them along these lines. But the real deal is there's a number of legislation in this chamber and the other chamber that we entertain. I think we should come up with one comprehensive sex offender legislation that addresses the entire gamut of what is that we're going to do here in the State of Illinois. We go from A to Z when it comes to sex offender laws. So, my question to you, Representative, is would you be willin' to sit down and to be a part of a comprehensive sex offender commission, committee, as a Legislator and help craft something that addresses, in a more comprehensive form, laws that affect or relate to sex offenders?"

Osmond: "I'm always willing to cooperate. Yes, Sir."

Dunkin: "So, would you... Do you see how this sort of collab... collab... corroborates what I'm trying to get..."

Osmond: "I think this is an important part of it, yes."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Dunkin: "So, I think, really, all of us, I'm sure there's probably one out of six of us here has a sex offender Bill or that... maybe one out of two of us are probably on a number of sex offender Bills. But I think until we address this again in a more comprehensive form, we're going to keep comin' up with piecemeal approaches towards what it is that we're tryin' to do and that's to make sure that we... that this society is protected from sex offenders and that we come up with a responsible legislation that impacts that community as well as it relates to makin' sure that we move in the right direction. So, I'm glad to hear that. I plan on supportin' your Bill."

Osmond: "Thank you, Sir."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Eddy: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I understand the concerns that folks have when we... we begin to bring several different Bills regarding topics and especially as a... in regards to sex offenders. And I'm not sure that there doesn't need to be a more comprehensive look as Representative... the previous speaker suggested. However, I think that the Representative has brought to us a way that we can reasonably address a situation that's occurring now in our schools that is, quite frankly, very dangerous. And I think she's doing it in a way that respects the individual's right to vote, doesn't take that away and I've been workin' on this issue for two (2) or three (3) years now and I know we had a similar

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

with a different brought type of concern Bill by Representative Jefferson to committee. And we're working together I think to come up with a way to address that problem while still allowing this balance of the right to vote and making sure that the... the school children in those polling places where schools are selected. Now, last year, we passed a Bill out of here that just simply said they They couldn't vote at all. couldn't vote at all. people voted for that. People voted for that Bill. allows that right to vote and it does it in a responsible manner while protecting our children. This is legislation. It deserves an 'aye' vote. And we should revisit the entire issue, however, this needs to be passed to protect our children now from any circumstance where a sex offender might come on to the school ground and make contact with a child. We need to deal with that while still allowing the right to vote. One other quick note. the time this Bill has moved through the process, the ACLU has never on any occasion questioned whether or not a right was being violated as long as they had the opportunity to vote at an alternative location. There was some concern, it was voting early only, but they have no problem with this. This is agreed to by the clerks; it's agreed to that this is a reasonable approach. And I urge an 'aye' vote to protect those children in this manner."

Speaker Hannig: "We had three speak in favor and two in opposition. The rules of debate would provide that one additional speaker can speak in opposition or in response.

Representative Lang, are you in opposition or response?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Lang: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've a couple questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Yeah. Well, that would be response, so..."

Lang: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Lang: "Representative, I missed part of this debate and so if this question was asked, I apologize. But don't we have a Bill floating through here somewhere that would just simply end the practice of voting at schools because of school superintendents' concern for school safety?"

Osmond: "It was my Bill and it was defeated in committee yesterday."

Lang: "So... so, if we had done that Bill, we wouldn't have needed this Bill, presumably, correct?"

Osmond: "That's correct, yes."

Lang: "All right. Well, as long as we're on the subject, what was the reason that Bill might have been defeated? What were people saying?"

Osmond: "The school authorities did not believe that it... that you should close the school during the voting."

Lang: "I'm sorry. Say that again, I didn't hear you."

Osmond: "The school authorities slipped it and said that that should not be closed for voting. That... that they have certain requirements that they need to meet and this would be against that."

Lang: "So did... so... so, I wasn't talking about a Bill that would close schools. I was talking about a Bill that said there would be not voting at schools. Don't we have a Bill around here like that?"

Osmond: "I'm sorry. I'm a little confused. Just one second."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Lang: "Sure."

Osmond: "My Bill was basically not to allow schools to be a polling place."

Lang: "Right. And the schools... would... the schools opposed it?"

Osmond: "The schools would have to find an alternative to like a parent-teacher conference or something to that effect so that the children would not be present during voting."

Lang: "Well, now you've twisted..."

Osmond: "If they are a polling place, they must close. If a school's a polling place, they would close under my old Bill."

Lang: "Isn't there a Bill somewhere, maybe it's Representative Eddy that has a Bill to prohibit schools from being polling places at all?"

Osmond: "I'm sorry. I don't know that one."

Lang: "All right. 'Cause I've had some school districts...
schools in my district talk to me about that. They're
trying to get away from the bringing people into the schools
that don't have school business. That would... that would
resolve this issue as well, wouldn't it?"

Osmond: "Well, we... Yes. We had a problem in... in my district alone that because of the new law about a hundred (100) feet, they're coming into the school and they had to segregate a whole area now where children... students cannot be present and that is a problem."

Lang: "Right. So, do you think it would be appropriate for us to have a Bill that would prohibit schools from being polling places?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Osmond: "That would be a major, major problem in Lake County, because we have so many of 'em there."

Lang: "All right. So, I'm not necessarily opposed to your Bill, but I have this question and every time we have a sex offender Bill that's similar to this, I have really the same question. Why do we just limit this to sex offenders? So, murderers can come into the school un... if we pass this Bill and they can vote. Arsonists can come into the school and vote if you pass this Bill. Why just sex offenders?"

Osmond: "Because this is a specific offense against children and children are who we're trying to protect here."

Lang: "Well, what if someone had murdered a children... a child or burned down a school? They wouldn't be sex offenders, but they'd be allowed to come in and vote, right?"

Osmond: "Well, it depends on the nature of the offense."

Lang: "Explain that."

Osmond: "A person that murders a child, do they... One moment, I'm sorry."

Lang: "I'm not goin' anywhere. We're going to be here 'til August or September. Don't... Take your time."

Osmond: "Thank you."

Lang: "Sure. How are you, Mr. Speaker? Maybe I could talk to you while we're waiting. You doin' all right?"

Osmond: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Yes."

Osmond: "Felons cannot vote. So, if... a... committed a murder against a child, they wouldn't have the right to vote anyway."

Lang: "Well, so are there sex offenders that are not felons?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Osmond: "We're not sure. Just one moment."

Lang: "I'm still here, really."

Osmond: "Thank you."

Lang: "I'm sure the Speaker will fill in this time for me."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang, your time has expired."

Lang: "Well, could..."

Speaker Hannig: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Lang: "Well, I don't have any remarks yet, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay."

Lang: "Perhaps you could give me back the time that has sort of been waiting time, as they say. But I think I can complete my comments as soon as I get an answer to the question. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "We'll have the Lady answer your question and then you can conclude your remarks."

Osmond: "Represen... Representative Lang, there are certain sex offenses... sex offenders that are considered misdemeanors and they would still have the right to vote, felons would not."

Lang: "All right. So, now we're getting down to it. So, all felons can't vote, correct?"

Osmond: "Yes. I mean, correct."

Lang: "Right. And... and not all sex offenders are felons..."

Osmond: "Correct."

Lang: "So what you're really doing here is adding that one niche of sex offender that is a... not a felon to the list of people that can't vote, in precinct?"

Osmond: "Well, if it's a school. If it's a designated area, that is a school."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Lang: "Right. All right. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I've nothing further to say. The Representative's answered all of my questions. Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, we've now had three speak in favor and three in response and the rules of debate would provide that, Representative Osmond is recognized to close."
- Osmond: "Thank you. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open.
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
 voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this
 question, there are 110 voting 'yes' and 3 voting 'no'. And
 this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is
 hereby declared passed. Representative Munson, did you get
 things worked out so we can read your Bill? Okay. So,
 we're going to go back to House Bill 1979 and Representative
 Munson is recognized."
- Munson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, House Bill 1979 creates the new offense of luring a minor. And after having a discussion with Representative Fritchey, I think we have some language we can agree to work on in the Senate."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, Representative Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Well, thank you, Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is how the process is supposed to work. The woman has a very, very good Bill that had one provision that I thought was troubling. She was gracious enough to pull it out of the record. I met with her and staff and she has agreed to work over on the Senate side to have some language put in which will make a very, very good Bill an excellent Bill. I

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

thank her for her professionalism, her work on this, her fine staff. And I strongly support an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that I cannot support, again. And the thing is is that at some point we're luring a mar... minors... at some point we have gotten away from being parents and we want the law to take advantage. So, this Bill is just another Bill to... kids now are on the computer all day long and then people get on the computer, girls raise their age, boys raise their age, people pretend to be people who they are not and they are all kinds of things and then we say now that we're going to send kids to jail for dating or meeting people or luring them when, first of all, the very first thing is that we should be teaching our kids not to be on the computer trying to date anyway and not raising their ages and pretending to be somebody that they're not. And with... every day we're passing more and more sex offender laws. First, we got to define what a sex offender is. Everybody's a sex offender and so we're creating more and more laws that we're putting people in jail because we are failing as a parent. I just urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Munson to close."

Munson: "First, I want to indicate that this Bill does not create a sex offender offense. Secondly, the changes that we're making might address some of the concerns for an unlawful purpose would only apply if the unlawful purpose is a Class A misdemeanor or higher. That would be the changes

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

that we would be making in the Senate. I'd like to thank Representative Fritchey and others on the... on the Judiciary Committee and ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Jefferies, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative... Representative Howard, would you like to handle House Bill 1503 for Representative Patterson? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1503, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Howard."

Howard: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #1 changes the age from 13 to 18 for the legal purchasing or public possession of an air rifle. A person under the age of 18 may still possess or own an air rifle with parental consent. It also deletes the ability of these individuals to carry an air rifle in public places even if it's unloaded."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Okay. We got a couple of people that wish to speak, so we'll put it on Stan... on Standard Debate. And Representative Black, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "I... I understand what the Representative is trying to do. It's certainly becoming more of a problem if somebody carries a... a look-alike weapon, but an air rifle, what we call in my... when I was young, a BB gun and since the Bill clearly states 'air rifle', I don't know whether it covers an air pistol. But I think I got my first BB gun from my father when I was 13, maybe 14 years old and I learned how to handle that and a target in the backyard under my father's supervision. So, I learned at an early age how to respect any kind of firearm, whether it was a, as I recall, it was a Red Ryder Daisy airgun and Red... Red Ryder was a... Mr. Speaker, I cannot even hear myself talk. I don't know what's going on behind me and I don't really want to turn around and find out."

Speaker Hannig: "Let's give the Gentleman some attention, please. Representative Black."

Black: "You know, if you'd let us carry air rifles on the floor and we could turn around and plink some of these people, might be able to get... might be able to get a little order around here, but... Yeah, it was a threat. Put that in the record. It was a threat. The lan... I mean, the way this House Floor runs anymore is a disgrace to a third-grade classroom. Nobody pays any attention to anything. Ya all know how you're going to vote. Ya all go to receptions. Ya all cut your deals in the backroom. And the poor mushrooms, those of us that are left out here on the floor, we don't have any clue what's goin' on. We just try to do the best we can on the issues that people send us down here for. And

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

they're... the people who sent me down here would not be appreciative if I'd vote for this Bill that says you can't give your son or your daughter a Daisy BB gun and teach them how to use it in... in the privacy of your yard. I also learned to fire a BB gun at Boy Scout camp and there are various shooting clubs around the State of Illinois that use They are not fatal by any means no matter what somebody would tell ya. If you do get plinked up alongside the head, it'll sting, I'll guarantee ya that, but it isn't going to kill anybody. And you're raising the age from thirteen (13) to eighteen (18). I think that's a pretty hefty jump at which someone would be allowed to possess a BB gun. If... if the Lady's intent is to outlaw look-alike guns, I share that concern, but I really don't and I guess all I have to draw on is the day of my youth when I was given a BB gun by my father, I think probably at the age of thirteen (13), I can't remember. But that's how I learned to handle a firearm, how to respect a firearm, what to do, how to work it, that you don't point it at somebody. I don't know. guess maybe things have changed so much that I'm sort of glad I was a child when I was and not... not the way things If this is a particular problem in the more are now. densely populated urban areas, I wish the Bill would reflect that. I don't see it as a problem in a district like mine. And it's... while I have great respect for the Sponsor, I think this Bill simply goes too far, particularly in what is primarily a rural area where BB guns have always been more or less a right of passage. And I guess I would leave you with my strong belief that if parents would take more

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

responsibility in orienting their children to what a BB gun is, I think you could see a corresponding decrease in the amount of unscrupulous, foolish, and lack of respect for any firearm that people seem to exhibit today. I, in all due respect to the Sponsor, intend to vote 'no' on the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Monique... Excuse me. Representative Howard, did you..."

Howard: "Yes, I'd like to respond to something that..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative... Representative Howard, I..."

Howard: "...Representative Black says."

Speaker Hannig: "This... this is... He had a chance to speak.

You'll get a chance to close or someone may ask you a
question, but the next..."

Howard: "Very... very well."

Speaker Hannig: "...the next... the next speaker will be Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Davis, M.: "Representative, I'm trying to understand. Are we increasing or decreasing the age from thirteen (13) to eighteen (18)?"

Howard: "Initially, we indicated that it would be thirteen (13), now it's eighteen (18). So, we're increasing the age."

Davis, M.: "So, if a 13-year-old has one of these airguns or paintguns, would that person be guilty?"

Howard: "The Bill does not preclude anyone who's under the age of eighteen (18) from possessing the... the gun if there is parental consent."

Davis, M.: "And what happens with the 18-year-old?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Howard: "Well, they're... they're considered to be responsible enough to have such a weapon."

Davis, M.: "So, an 18-year-old will be capable of purchasing and carrying an air rifle, a BB gun, a paintgun. Is that correct?"

Howard: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "But a 13-year-old has to have parental consent?"

Howard: "That would be correct."

Davis, M.: "And what are the penalties?"

Howard: "It would be a Class B misdemeanor."

Davis, M.: "Which... What kind of offense is that? How much jail time?"

Howard: "We don't have that information right at our disposal."

Davis, M.: "Did you say a Class..."

Howard: "Class B misdemeanor."

Davis, M.: "Not a Class A, a Class B misdemeanor. Maybe that's no jail time, I'm not sure. Some of the lawyers in here can tell us. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "...Bill."

Davis, M.: "I know that the Sponsor and also the Lady carrying this Bill has all the best intentions in the world, but I know that there are children and young people in suburban areas who do play with that paintball plastic gun and so forth. I'm not sure that they do cause bodily harm, but I just wonder if it's illegal for people to have, shouldn't it be illegal for people to sell? You know, it concerns me that we are only going to punish the person who purchase it or... purchases it or have it. We're not going to purchase (sic-punish) the seller and that really does concern me. If

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

you have the... the legal ability to sell it, I should have the legal ability to buy it and if not, I'm really concerned with what the objective of this legislation really is. Is this objective... is this another objective to sweep up young people and give 'em a criminal record, another criminal record because a kid or someone bought a toy? Connie, because you're carrying this Bill I'm going to vote 'yes', but this is very bad legislation. It is very bad legislation that once again allows a person to sell something, but when I buy it I can be arrested. There's something wrong with that kind of legislation. Giving a criminal record to people who did nothing but buy a toy, a toy that was legally sold. Connie, I'm going to vote 'yes' because you're carrying the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you. Is there a paintball exception to this?"

Howard: "No, there is no paintball exception."

Rose: "Okay. That's, I think... what are we doing? There is... I mean, every kid in America has shot a BB gun at some point in time in their lives. Boy Scout camps, you shoot BB guns all day long. That's what you do at Boy Scout camp. How many people have shot a BB gun? Come on. I have nothing else to say."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We've had three speak... three speak in opposition. The rules would provide that two additional speakers could be in support of the Bill. So, we're looking for support. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "No... This would be in response if you have a question, right?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Well, no. Unfortunate..."

Mautino: "A technical question on the Bill drafted it as it is because I think it may be also drafted wrong."

Speaker Hannig: "If you want to ask a technical question, I'll..."

Mautino: "Okay. Of the Sponsor, here is a... if you look on... on
the... in the language of it itself, it says that a person
under the age of eighteen (18) may not sell, lend, transfer...
Are you with me there?"

Howard: "I think I am."

Mautino: "Okay. Yeah. If you look in the Bill there, basically, if my 15-year-old son lets his cousin who is thirteen (13) borrow his paintball gun, he has technically committed a Class B misdemeanor, the way it's drafted. So, we've actually made my son letting his cousin borrow his extra paintball gun to play in the back of my yard a Class B misdemeanor. Is that correct? This is my technical question. That would be a 'yes'?"

Howard: "If it is within the backyard, there's an exception."

Mautino: "That isn't defined. It says may not transfer... Well, just the act of giving it to his cousin then, who's on the other side of the road, is a... it's a misdemeanor? Is a Class... Okay. That's my technical question. According to our attorneys in the back row here, the answer is 'yes'. So, a Class B for anyone under eighteen (18), cousin to cousin, friend to friend, to give 'em a BB gun, a pellet gun, a paintball gun, we've made them a Class B... That may be a technical error, but if it is, I'm not actually in response then I'd be opposed. Thanks for letting me ask that question."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Hannig: "So, the rule would provide that two additional speakers could be in support of the Bill. So, we're looking for supporters. Representative Winters, are you in support?"

Winters: "I have a constitutional or a question for the attorney."

Speaker Hannig: "For the parliamentarian?"

Winters: "Parliamentarian, excuse me."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, say..."

Winters: "A question for the parliamentarian. If this Bill receives the requisite 100 'no' votes, whose name will be listed as a member of the Century Club, Representative Patterson or Representative Howard?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Howard."

Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As always is the case when my colleague calls upon me to assist, I'm ready to do that. It appears that the… the support is… is not there and I'm going to be in touch with him and ask him what he wants me to do at this point. So, I would like the Bill to be pulled out of the record."

Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Representative Howard. So, Representative Phelps, you have House Bill 1847. Representative Phelps. Out of the record. Representative Pihos, you have House Bill 1647. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1647, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Pihos."

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This legislation is intended to provide the same legal rights to

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

privileged communications in schools afforded to minors under the Illinois Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Confidentiality Act. It provides for confidentiality of information of a personal nature disclosed by a pupil twelve (12) years of age or older while in the process of receiving school counseling services, school psychological services or school social work services. I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on... this is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry you didn't see my light before you called for the vote. The only concern I had about this legislation, given what just happened at Virginia Tech University, that student was referred to the school counseling office, as I understand it. Now, I don't know whether he ever went and I don't know whether he ever had a... a session, but with the confidentiality put in this Bill, my concern was, to what extent does that confidentiality take precedent over someone who might be expressing hostile actions or intent as the young man did at Virginia Tech. If we're going to allow that kind of confidentiality not to be shared with school officials and/or police officials, then I

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

think that Bill is, in light of what has happened, is... could be potentially a dangerous piece of legislation. I'm sorry I didn't get to ask a question and have the Sponsor respond. I would hope the Senate would take a look at that because you can carry confidentiality and I think we would all want confidentiality if we were talking about problems at home, problems with our girl or boyfriend or teacher or grades, but if... if the subject comes up that... and this was not a minor by the way, obviously a senior in college... if a problem should arise that the counselor has reason to believe may result in extreme violence, I would hope that confidentiality would not become the overriding concern. I would hope that the Senate will take a look at that on the record."

Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Representative Black. Also, Representative Pihos, you have House Bill 1684. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1684, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Pihos."

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill provides that the production or possession of more than two hundred (200) cannabis plants is a Class I rather than a Class II felony. I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And in response, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Molaro."

Molaro: "Will the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Speaker Hannig: "Yes. She indicates she'll yield."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Molaro: "Great. This is probationable, though. We didn't make it nonprobationable, did we?"

Pihos: "That was a different Bill."

Molaro: "Was it... So, this is probational?"

Pihos: "Yes."

Molaro: "All right. Thank you. And then if the Speaker will yield. Representative, did you just have the last Bill?"

Pihos: "I did."

Molaro: "What'd you get two in a row?"

Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then Representative Pihos to close."

Pihos: "Yes. I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1684 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open.
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Representative Brosnahan, do you wish to be
recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question,
there are 108 voting 'yes' and 8 voting 'no'. And this
Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby
declared passed. Representative Poe, you have House Bill
1959. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1959, a Bill for an Act concerning state employees. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Poe."

Poe: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill that would create a State Travel Expense Reimbursement Act and no known opposition."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone speak in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hoffman and Osterman, do you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Poe, are you seeking recognition? Okay. The Gentleman is not seeking recognition. Representative Reitz, you have House Bill 1780. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1780, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1780 changes the name for the Conservation 2000 Fund and the Conservation 2000 Project Fund to Partners for Conservation and Partners for Conservation Project Fund. It also expands the use to include natural resource restoration and preservation, water quality protection, a number of other things. And it extends the sunset date. And it's an initiative of the department and the soil and water conservation districts, park districts, a number of environmental groups and I know of no opposition."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hernandez, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 2304?"

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2304 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Rita, you have House Bill 559. Would you like us to read that on Third? Representative Rita. Out of the record. How about House Bill 1467, Representative Rita? Out of the record. Representative Sacia, you have House Bill 1407. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1407, a Bill for an Act concerning used tires. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1407 simply asks the… the state to allow a recycling site for used tires for small dealers. They currently… it currently is provided for individuals. The State of Illinois, the Department of Revenue requires all sales of tires to have an additional \$2.50 added. That money is sent to the State of Illinois to the Department of Revenue and it was my request with this Bill to have small retailers also have the ability to dispose of these used tires at retail sites or at sites across the state. It

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

passed through the committee with my under... with the understanding that I would try to come to consensus with the Illinois EPA who is opposed to the Bill. They felt they already did it for individuals and did not need to do it for small retailers. Contacting EPA representative John Cook, he basically told me this past Friday that EPA is not willing to compromise at all. They wouldn't even discuss an Amendment, simply that if I pass it out of the House they can probably kill it somewhere else. I found... found this to be very... I don't want to use the word disingenuous but they wouldn't even discuss coming up with an Amendment. just go ahead and run your Bill and see what happens. I'm asking for the support of the Body. It's good large retailers still pay to have legislation. The franchisers come in and haul away the used tires, but there are many small dealers that have tire sales incidental to their business where they may sell used cars. example, they don't normally put tires on, but occasionally they do and they will encumber, you know, a hundred (100), hundred and fifty (150), two hundred (200) tires a year and it's simply asking that we allow the ... or authorize the EPA to have those sites and accepted from small dealers as well as individuals. I ask for your support. And I'd be happy to answer questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Collins

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

and Jefferies, do you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sacia, you have House Bill 1403. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1403, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1403 was brought to me by a deputy sheriff from Jo Daviess County, Illinois, kind of a bizarre situation. A church sold its parsonage. The parsonage is just 20 feet from the church itself. As fate would have it, a methamphetamine manufacturer moved into the parsonage and this Bill simply requires that methamphetamine manufactured closer than a thousand (1,000) feet from a church or other facility like a church, would be aggravated as opposed to simple. So, that's my purpose in bringing this legislation. And again, I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And in response, Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Winters: "Jim, one question. And that is, is there any definition of what a former church building is? We can often have parsonages that are not next to a church building that may have been sold, old churches, small churches that have closed and no longer need a parsonage. Is there any

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

time limit? It could be fifty (50) years ago that that residence was a parsonage at onetime and no longer is. Have you got any provision in there for that?"

Sacia: "I don't, Representative Winters, and you make a good point. This was... that's not a question that came up in committee or any other time, but it... it does make a good point."

Winters: "Might pass that along to the Senate Sponsor when it goes over there that they oughta have some, you know..."

Sacia: "Definition..."

Winters: "...five (5) years, ten (10) years and if it's an older conversion away from being a parsonage, I don't see the need for it."

Sacia: "Thank you."

Winters: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We've got a couple additional Members wishing to speak. So, we're going to put this on Standard Debate. And Representative Nekritz, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, I'm just curious why it should be aggravated if it's next to a church, relative to or religious institution, versus any other building?"

Sacia: "Well, I think the... I think it was just the fact that it was so, I guess I could say, invasive, so hurtful to the people in the community to think that we already have laws where methamphetamine distribution close, or any type of narcotics distribution, close to a parsonage... not necessarily a parsonage... a church or a school is a

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

significant issue. Accordingly, the feeling here was that if we had... had it aggravated, it would send a strong message."

Nekritz: "But don't we want a strong message that we don't want a meth labs anywhere and why... so why shouldn't we, if we're just going to... if we're going to enhance the penalty for religious institutions... I guess I just don't see a distinction between having it at a religious... near a religious institution versus any other place where the meth lab can cause danger to the community."

Sacia: "I think it... another big part of it, Representative, is you've got an area where a large congregation, if you will, or a large number of people are congregating and if you did have an explosion, which is very typical in a methamphetamine manufacturing facility, you would be, you know, creating injury or death to large numbers of people."

Nekritz: "So, I just don't know. Do we... do we have an... an aggravated penalty for it being near a school or a stadium or some other place where people congregate?"

Sacia: "I don't have that answer. Let me see if I can get a staff member."

Nekritz: "So, your... your legislation though doesn't amend something that already said 'school' and you just added 'religious institution'?"

Sacia: "Absolutely not, no."

Nekritz: "Okay."

Sacia: "It is new specifically for churches based on this specific situation."

Nekritz: "Okay. Thank you."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Representative Molaro."

Molaro: "Well, I'll just be real quick. You know, it has here worship, parsonage or former church facility. What's a 'former church facility'?"

Sacia: "This particular situation, Representative Molaro, was where they had no longer... no longer had a need for the parsonage and sold it off. So, I guess or are you asking me to be more specific than that?"

Molaro: "No, no, no. I guess what I'm getting at, ya just asked, you know, it's near a church where people congregate, Representative Nekritz and that sounded like a pretty good answer. People are congregating there and there's a lot of people."

Sacia: "Right."

Molaro: "Now, we... you know, when I look at 'former church facility', maybe an abandoned facility where no one is gathering. So, why... why would we make it that you can't do it within a thousand (1,000) feet of a former church facility, but we can't do it within a thousand (1,000) feet of your house? I'd rather protect you and your family in your home than some former church facility that doesn't even exist. Why should that be nonaggravated?"

Sacia: "Was that the end of..." or did I miss something there,

Representative Molaro?"

Molaro: "Yeah. Well..."

Sacia: "I... I..."

Molaro: "...yeah, I just want to... I'm trying to figure it out, that's all. I mean, I'm not going to stop the Bill, but

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

just... What was the reasoning where we would make it aggravating if it was a former abandoned church as opposed to your or my house where our family sleeps? Why is it more important to protect a former church than it is to protect a thousand (1,000) feet of my house?"

Sacia: "You ask a very good question and I guess I go back to committee where when we discussed this, the issue was we were basing it pretty much on what happened in Jo Daviess County where the former parsonage was no longer a parsonage but we still had the existing church."

Molaro: "Right."

Sacia: "And I think that was what caused the aggravated situation."

Molaro: "But it was a former church, right? So, now, it's an abandoned building like any other abandoned building."

Sacia: "But it was 20 feet from a church. From a..."

Molaro: "I know."

Sacia: "...from a church that is still active. The church itself is a functioning Sunday gathering place for citizens in Jo Daviess County."

Molaro: "Okay. So, then... Well, then, I don't want to say read it with me 'cause, so and your Bill is only three sentences. Says, the manufacturing of methamphetamine occurs within a thousand (1,000) feet of a place of worship, makes sense, parsonage, makes sense, or a former church facility. Now, that makes no sense."

Sacia: "I would be happy to take that out, you know, work with the Senate Sponsor and... and take that..."

Molaro: "All right. Perfect. And then, this..."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Sacia: "...take that out of there."
- Molaro: "...this is the same Bill as the tire Bill that you just had. So, you now have two..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Molaro, could you bring your remarks to a close. Okay. The Gentleman is finished.

 Representative Graham."
- Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm sorry, Representative Sacia. I may have been outside or I don't know if it had been... the question had been asked. What is the origin of this piece of legislation?"
- Sacia: "It came to me from Jo Daviess County Sheriff's Department where they had a church sell off its parsonage which was just twenty (20) feet from the church and the parsonage or where the pastor had lived now became a manufacturing facility for a methamphetamine lab."
- Graham: "Okay. Are there laws, I'm sure there are, but I'm just going to ask the question, laws on the books right now for manufacturing methamphetamine?"
- Sacia: "Absolutely, yes."
- Graham: "What are the penalties in place right now for the manufacturing in a particular home? Let's say that the home was on a neighborhood block. What are the current penalties for that?"
- Sacia: "It can vary anywhere from a... a Class IV to a Class X felony depending upon the aggravated nature or the amount of production."
- Graham: "Okay. Again, I'm sorry to be asking these questions again."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Sacia: "No, not at all."

Graham: "Does this legislation... this legislation increases the penalties already on the books for a church... meth labs near churches?"

Sacia: "No. It just simply says you cannot do it that close to a.m. a church facility."

Graham: "Okay. It simply says you cannot do it, but we already have a law on the books that says you can't do it in the first place but we... we're putting a law on the books that says you can't do it near a church and you're not increasing the penalties?"

Sacia: "No. It is an increased penalty. The judge can consider it aggravated and use a higher level because it is aggravated, because of the church being involved. It would give him or her another level to charge."

Graham: "Are you saying that... maybe you... maybe you can't answer this question but maybe you can, the increased sitings of methamphetamine labs in your area?"

Sacia: "I'm sorry. Were you asking if there's a lot of methamphetamine?"

Graham: "Yes."

Sacia: "Yes, there is. In rural northwest Illinois, it... it's really on the increase and it's becoming a very significant problem in the rural law enforcement community."

Graham: "I'm just concerned that I, too, don't want meth labs in the community..."

Sacia: "Sure."

Graham: "...you know, I support you in that effort. I'm just concerned that, you know, this would be... people who are in

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

the grips of substance abuse do things that we just don't want them to do."

Sacia: "Exactly."

Graham: "I would agree with that. But when are we going to really, really get on the stick about providing programs and the money to help get people out of these situations. And I know it's a tough market because... we've been fighting heroin and crack cocaine in our area for a long time and now meth is on the scene and I do understand the fight. I don't want to minimize the terror and the health risks that this causes. So, I commend for the thought of this piece of legislation. I just think that, you know, this is just to be near a church, you know, I mean what are we doing here? I mean... I mean, why would the penalties be different... and I heard the Representative asking about it... why would the penalties be different from near a church than next door to somebody's home?"

Sacia: "I think the best answer I can give you, Representative Graham, is again, the manufacture of methamphetamine is such a dangerous manufacturing as opposed to the manufacturing or the cutting of cocaine you're not putting the lives of numerous people around you at risk from an explosion."

Graham: "Well, I guess... I guess I would disagree with that because of people making crack cocaine have burned down buildings..."

Sacia: "Yes, they have."

Graham: "...you know, in the manufacturing of that. There has been a recent epidemic in the City of Chicago where heroin

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

production has killed a number of people. I mean, there were maybe about..."

Sacia: "Yeah."

- Graham: "...thirteen (13) deaths related to the production of, you know, and the use of the... the heroin. People getting the drug and walkin' away and dieing from it and not gettin' a second chance to, you know, make a different decision."
- Sacia: "Representative, I... I think you and I are exactly on the same page. We recognize that both of them are very volatile in nature and... and we're creating a very... a substance that really is something that's of great detriment to our society. However, the substances used in the manufacture of methamphetamine is so extremely volatile in nature, anhydrous ammonia being one good example, you know, the explosive characteristics of that, ether being example, the explosive characteristics of that and that was the purpose of the Jo Daviess County Sheriff's Department in bringing this request for legislation to me."
- Graham: "Well, I'm undecided about where I'll, you know, I'll continue to listen to the debate..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, your... your time has expired.

 Do you need to bring your remarks to a close."
- Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just think that since we have a law on the books already. This is just create... you know, increasing some penalties that I'm not sure how they really come into play, but thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The rules provide for one additional speaker in favor of the Bill. Representative Franks, would you like to speak in support?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Franks: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Proceed."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

Franks: "Representative, I'm looking at our analysis and what it indicates is that there already are some certain situations where the manufacturer would get aggravated count. And what we are showing is it's a multiunit dwelling, in a structure with a child under eighteen (18), in a structure with a pregnant woman, in a structure protected by firearms or other dangerous means. Those are the... Right now, those are aggravated."

Sacia: "Yes, Sir."

Franks: "My understanding is what you're trying to do is to include places of worship, parsonage or a former church facility."

Sacia: "That's correct, Sir."

Franks: "Okay. So, right now, we do have the aggravated, this is in additional."

Sacia: "It is an addition, thank you."

Franks: "I'd like you to look at the text of the Bill on page 4, and I was reading and it's paragraph H. And it's..."

Sacia: "Yes, Sir."

Franks: "...your Amendment to the existing aggravated statute.

It's simple. It says that... it says that if the manufacture occurs within a thousand (1,000) feet of place of worship, parsonage or former church facility."

Sacia: "Yes, Sir."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Franks: "Okay. Now, Representative Molaro had brought out some issues and I think you would agree that it could be changed on the Senate side."

Sacia: "I'm certainly going to request that, Sir."

Franks: "And I'd agree with him as I'm reading this here and I know it's simil… where I… we live very near each other and where we have like former church facilities I've seen they're antique stores now."

Sacia: "Yes, Sir."

Franks: "So, I don't think that's what you're trying to accomplish..."

Sacia: "Not at all."

Franks: "...but the thousand (1,000) feet near a place of worship would take care of what you needed, correct?"

Sacia: "Yes, Sir."

Franks: "So, as long... with that understanding, that it would be corrected on the Senate side, I think you have a very strong Bill and I think you'll get to where you need to go."

Sacia: "Thank you."

Franks: "Thank you."

Sacia: "Appreciate it."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Sacia to close."

Sacia: "I just ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

hereby declared passed. Representative Watson, for what reason do you rise?"

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Watson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could have your attention for one moment. I'd... I'd... Do we tend to take many things in this world for granted and I think sometimes we forget how blessed we truly are. One thing we should not take for granted is the service of our men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan today. We debate a lot of issues on this floor and we have an opportunity to point out and to discuss and to... to praise a lot of good men and women. Well, I want to introduce you to a man next to me, Josh Adams, who's been a staffer on our side of the aisle since 2002, he's a former Marine, a graduate of Western Illinois University and he serves with the 1144th Transportation National Guard Division out of Delavan. Josh has a six-month-old child and another child on the way and tomorrow he will be activated and on his way to Kuwait. We have... we have a hero among us, Ladies and Gentlemen, I just would hope that we could rise and give him a... a standing ovation. And Josh, we will keep you in our thoughts and your family in our thoughts and prayers and we wish you Godspeed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to Josh and his family, I want to... I want to recognize that, you know, when we're talking about military service over the generations

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

we've... we've come up with such phrases as the Greatest Generation and those who have sacrificed more are... are more nobly than others. I can think of no better example of this generation than Josh Adams, he... a young man who is committed to his country, to his state, to his family, who has taken this opportunity to step up in a very difficult time. We're not involved in a very popular war, but the men and women who have to fight the war don't have a say about that. When they're called, they have signed on the dotted line; they step forward. Josh Adams represents, I think, indeed what is one of the best generations we could... we could recognize. Thank you, Josh."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, would like to join in my appreciation to I've worked with Josh over the years in terms of different things; he does a great job. In particularly, on Sunday at 2:30 we're going to be sending the 1144th and sending them a farewell in Delavan. I have the good fortune of representing Delavan, a small community of about eleven hundred (1100) folks in Tazewell County. So, Congressman LaHood, Senator Brady, and I have the honor to be able to wish Josh and his colleagues well. We will be doing that at 3:00, Sunday afternoon in Delavan, Illinois. Certainly, anyone who'd like to come we'd be more than happy to have you there. Regardless of what we think of ... of the conflict we're engaged in now, we wish our thoughts and prayers go with all the brave young men and women who are going over to the Middle East to fight for our freedom. So, I want to

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

thank Josh for your dedication to the United States as well as to the 1144th who I will be saying goodbye to on Sunday. Thank you."

- Speaker Hannig: "Returning to the Order of House Bills-Third Reading. Representative Osterman, you have House Bill 1795.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1795, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Osterman."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Osterman: the House. House Bill 1795 deals with the growing problem of misclassification of employees as independent contractors in the construction industry in the state. It's a situation that's been studied and is a problem that is continuing to grow. The issue at hand is that some contractors in our state are using a system of having individuals act as independent contractors when in actuality, in all shapes and forms, they should be employees of that contractor. doing this, this has several negative effects: 1) to general contractors and contractors that are playing by the rules and hiring employees, they are on an uneven playing field. And they are being underbid and losing jobs because people can undercut using this individual... independent contractor. It's for its employees who lose out on benefits and rights and protections under State and Federal Law who are asked to be independent contractors and should be employees. lastly, this hurts the State of Illinois who loses out on millions of dollars in income tax on an annual basis and is

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

continuing, according to the study, to lose more and more based on this problem. What House Bill 1795 seeks to do is to have people that are employees in the... in the construction industry be deemed employees and it also sets a criteria by which people that are genuinely independent contractors, the sole proprietors, are defined and as a criteria established for that. But ultimately, Ladies and Gentlemen, what this will do is that for those people that are misusing this system, they will have to change the system or have penalties against them. And with that, I'm prepared to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 1795. And on that question, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You're interrupting my lunch order here so... Representative Osterman, we've discussed this quite at length in the committee and it did come out on a partisan Roll Call, I believe. The problem that I have is that this has very severe penalties for the first violation of the Act... excuse me... a first violation of the Act is fifteen hundred dollars (\$1500) and that's a per day penalty. If there's a second violation within five (5) years, it's a twenty-five hundred dollars (\$2500), if I'm... if that's the current status of the Bill. Is that correct?" Osterman: "It's a very good question and a good point that you bring up. It's up to fifteen hundred dollars (\$1500) for a first-time offense and up to twenty-five hundred dollars (\$2500) for a second offense within 5 years. And the reason

I say 'up to' because you and others have brought that point

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

up and the Department of Labor will have the discretion in the legislation it talks about them reviewing this and having the discretion to look at the scope of the problem when determining a... a penalty. And if someone mistakenly, a mom and pop contractor, has someone who they have as an independent contractor that should be an employee and if there's an investigation and they say, you know what, we should have hired this person as an employee. That'll be taken into consideration with the Department of Labor when they look at penalties and that's something that we've talked to the Department of Labor. We do not want to hurt the innocent people that are... that are contractors. We want to go after those people that are misusing the system."

Winters: "The other concern I have is... is the bright line test, if you will, that determines whether or not someone is a contractor or an employee. And I, in my farming operation, sometimes we don't really know if somebody is coming on to do a specific job. Are they providing the machinery? Is it the hours of operation? Is that determined by them or by the... the owner of the business? One of the provisions that you have that would... a lot of small business owners know exactly if I meant criteria A, B, and C, that is now an independent contractor. What... what provisions do you have in there?"

Osterman: "There's two steps. There's a 12-part test that identifies if someone is an independent contractor or a sole proprietor or partnership and if someone needs that criteria, they would be exempt from this legislation. If they fail that criteria, we would then go to a 3-part test

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

that would identify: are they acting on their own, are they solely responsible for what they've been contracted to do, are they, in fact, a... an employee of the... of the person, but that's been, you know, identified in the legislation. I want to point out that this legislation takes effect in January of '08. It would be my hope that when this is passed that everyone would have a... an interest in making sure that they know what the rules are and the criteria, and so that people aren't caught up with a mistake."

- Winters: "Well, my con... my concern is, again, if I understand it right, there's twelve (12) different determine... questions that you would ask. Do you have to meet all twelve (12) to be considered an independent contractor or does one... failure to meet one throw you out and then you become an employee?"
- Osterman: "If you met... if you met all twelve (12) of those, you'd be a sole proprietor or partnership and it would be exempt from this legislation. If you failed any of those twelve (12), it would then go to a 3-part determination. If someone passed that 3-part determination, they would be, again, exempt from that. So, if they are truly an independent contractor that's doing something free and separate, they would not be under this... covered under this legislation."
- Winters: "What... what are the three (3) steps because the way I understand it if you've got eleven (11) of the twelve (12) criteria, that the twelfth one you may have failed that. Then the determination goes to the 3-part test. What are the three (3) requirements in that?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Osterman: "The individual has been and will continue to be free of control and direction of the performance, service of the contract, both under the individual's contract and service and in fact, service performed by an individual's outside the usual course and services performed by a contractor and the individual's engaged in an independently established trade occupation, profession or business. So, the 12-part test, Representative Winters, I think, goes to really show that someone, an independent contractor, do they have their own equipment, do they provide services to the general public so that if you, as a business person, wanted to contract them you could look in the phonebook or go on a Web site and see that. The situation that's come up is that these people have been put on as independent contractors. If the... if the contractor puts 'em on, closes up shop one day, they're not a freestanding group. They are part of that... the larger..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Winters, your time has expired.

Could you bring your remarks to a close, please?"

Winters: "Well, my concern is, again, I think you've gone a long way on the… the 12-part and 3-part test that that probably is a relatively… relatively fair way to determine whether someone is a… an independent, but I am concerned it is not up to the negotiations between the department and the individual contractor. The department has the discretion to go up to that size of fines that we talked about earlier. I think it's not a good signal to send to Illinois business. And many businesses start as independent contractors, get their first foot in the door of providing trucking services

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

or other types of operations and to crank down on them, to make it harder for them to establish a business as an independent contractor, is not a good way to add employment, to add strength to our state economy. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Leitch."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. While I have great respect for the Sponsor, in my view this is absolutely one of the worst Bills I've seen all Session. This Bill seeks to upset about twenty (20) years of law that at that time resulted in what has been the independent contractor law for the last number of years. This Bill would drive out of business many, many small business people, many people who are trying to start businesses, many people who for years and years and years have made their livelihoods serving in one capacity or another as independent contractors. I would hope that the General Assembly would not change what is presently in place and would not even consider this as a remedy to in effect eliminate independent contractors in this state. So, I would strenuously, respectfully urge a 'no' vote. you."

Speaker Hannig: "We've had one in support and two in opposition.

Representative Black, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There's not a great deal I can add to what Representative Leitch pointed out. I don't believe the Representative sponsoring this Bill was here when we had numerous floor battles, court battles and finally reached

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

some compromise on the definition of an independent contractor. And I can remember those debates and if you're not careful how you structure this, for those of you who are realtors or real estate sales persons, you could find yourself caught up in this, because one of the arguments that we had years ago was that if you were a realtor, a sales person for a real estate company, as long as the realtor didn't mandate how many hours you spent in the office and how many open houses you would host, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, you were an independent contractor and not an employee. This Bill endangers all of the work that has been done and attempts to do by legislation what the courts and businesses have over the years agreed to. guess, whenever you have a disagreement or whatever happens, membership falls or whatever, you come to the General Assembly and you say, in effect, we're going to change all the rules, to heck with it. Let me just try and quote in the brief time I have from an e-mail I received from a constituent of mine who owns a manufactured housing business. He goes on and he says, 'I have recently closed one of my businesses due in part to a recent IDES audit of our trade contractors. We spent weeks proving that most of our legitimate business partners, who have spent thousands of dollars on their workers' compensation, unemployment insurance, advertising, tools, trucks, et cetera, were indeed independent contractors and not employees. We have decided after this audit conducted by the agency with the feeling that we are guilty unless we can be proven innocent that erodes profit and takes all of the ability to run a

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

legitimate business, I closed that firm. I own several other businesses and pray that I will not have to experience this sort of barrier to running my business in a profitable manner that supports the low prices that we must offer our consumers in order to stay in business. House Bill 1795 will simply magnify this horrible experience that we have just gone through to many businesses throughout the State of Illinois. House Bill 1795 implements a vague, confusing and extremely difficult definition of independent contractor that significantly undercuts traditional methods of defining subcontractor status. Current methods used by the Federal Government involve a more thorough evaluation of relationship between the worker and the employer. I would submit that these federal standards such as the Fair Labor Standards Act or the Internal Revenue Service Code should continue to be implemented to determine subcontractor status not 1795.' He just simply goes on in his e-mail to say how difficult it is for him to stay in business in Illinois and that this is simply one more nail in the coffin that so many businesses have experienced in the current Illinois climate and he... he doesn't threaten, he doesn't say he will leave, just simply says if 1795 and other such types of legislation continue to be enacted, it will be more and more difficult for him to stay in business. Ladies Gentlemen, four (4) years ago, by Secretary of State figures, we ran seventeen thousand (17,000) registered trucks out of the State of Illinois. I think that number's now up to about twenty-five thousand (25,000). Perhaps the Representative's district can absorb those kind of job

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

losses, my district cannot. At some point, labor and business... we used to have an Agreed Bill process, not on things like this, but even that has kind of gone by the wayside lately... at some point, those of you who are strong labor supporters, those of us who are strong business supporters with a modicum of support for labor are going to have to get together and figure out reasonable, commonsense legislation that will make the business climate, scratch that, make the jobs climate in Illinois more favorable. In closing, this is not a good Bill that go..."

Speaker Hannig: "Bring... could you bring your remarks to a close."

Black: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It goes too far as a "Yes. major employer in my district and an independent businessman says. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to have to get out of this mindset, it's us versus them, it's the employee versus the employer or the employer versus the employee. Why don't we just all sit down at a table and agree if there are no employers there are no jobs and if there are no jobs, then everything we hoped to do in the State of Illinois will suffer because tax revenue declines, people leave the state. This is simply..., in all due respect to the Sponsor who I like personally and professionally, we thought we had this settled about eighteen (18) or nineteen (19) years ago, here it is again. I can't do any better than quote a man who has to fight the battles every day, Federal Law should prevail. This is a bad Bill for Illinois business and those people who live in your district who try to stay employed. It's a bad jobs Bill. Vote 'no'."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Osterman to close."

- Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to respond to a couple things that were said by the previous speakers who I have great respect for. This is a good Bill for Illinois; it's a good Bill for the workers in Illinois; it's a good Bill for the contractors in Illinois. It levels the playing field and says that if an employee is an employee that they should be treated as such and have the benefits as such. It says that companies should not be skirting the law in their responsibility to pay income tax to our state that we all know we desperately need. This deals specifically with the construction industry and contractors are neutral on this legislation. But I ultimately think this is a good thing for the workers; it's a good thing for the business in the state. And I would respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in... all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes' and 51 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Okay."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lyons in the Chair.

 Representative Saviano, you have House Bill 129. Mr. Clerk,

 read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 129, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Skip Saviano."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 129 as amended simply extends the sunset date for the Clinical Social Work and Social Work Practice Act to January 1, 2018. I would ask that it be adopted. There's... there is no opponents to this and it's simply to advance this to the Senate to extend the sunset."
- Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking recognition. The question is, 'Should House Bill 129 pass?' All those in favor should signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Jerry Mitchell. Representative Mitchell. Jerry, you want to vote? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Schmitz, you have House Bill 3132. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3132, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tim Schmitz."
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House 3132 deals with veterans' license plates. Currently, the state issues a disabled veterans' license plate and the way it reads is you have to be 100 percent disabled to receive this plate. What we're proposing to do here in this Bill is that the state would issue a handicapped veterans' license plate to cover those individuals that were disabled

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

as a service member but do not meet the 100 percent disability requirement. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Anybody seeking a request to speak regarding House Bill 3132? Seeing not, the question is, 'Should House Bill 3132 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Washington, we have House Bill 1563. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1563, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Washington."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1563 comes out of the genesis of consumers not having to pay for services that they have not actually received. This incident surrounds the utility of gas in particular where a meter was put on a piece of property, was not fully installed yet several bills had came from the utility company to the consumer and those bills were paid in good faith by the consumer until later on it was realized that none of the service or the commodity had been received. The gas company's response at that point in time with that the bills received were for meter installation, but that proved not to be valid as well, because none of the prior bills that were

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

sent and paid said anything about these bills were for installation of a meter. It said estimated reading. So, that's the genesis of the Bill. The utility should bill the customer for the legally obtained commodity only and after the service meter has been connected or if the service is to a new construction after the meter has been connected to the service line. And I'm open for any questions as it relates to this legislation."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Michael Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Bost: "Representative, we'd be worked, and I know you have brought this back several times to committee, and we worked to try to give you advice on how to get the wording right. And I'm reading the wording over. Could you explain to the Body what the genesis of the Bill is exactly so that people understand the situation that occurred and it was with you, is that correct?"

Washington: "That's correct. As I stated a few minutes ago, the genesis of the Bill was in particular in this particular situation dealing with the gas company. And there was several bills sent and several bills paid in good faith and it came to be found out later that the meter that was installed by the gas company was not fully connected and there were estimated bills to new construction. So, after the error was brought to the attention of the utility company, it was said that the bills were legitimate because they were for the meter installation. But upon further

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

investigation, it was discovered that none of the bills that were sent said anything about that the estimated cost was for our meter. It said estimated gas usage. And so, that's at the genesis of this Bill to make sure that consumers are not ever charged for anything based on an estimate when they haven't received the service nor the commodity yet payment was received by the utility company. And also, the reimbursement or the correction did not come until several months later in terms of makin' the correct changes that were necessary."

Bost: "Representative, when I'm reading the language here and you keep saying that it's only for gas, but... but... and it's very simple language and I hope that the Body will pay attention to this. It's not just gas. It says 'billing for a utility commodity. A utility shall bill a customer for the legally obtained commodity only after the service meter has been connected or if the service is to the new construction after the meter has been connected to the service line.' Now, that service line could be water, that service line could be gas, that service line could be electricity. Is that not the way this reads?"

Washington: "That's correct, Representative. I see nothing wrong with the way it reads because this is a consumer friendly Bill that protects people from paying for things they didn't receive. In some instances..."

Bost: "And... and I have no problem with that. I... I mean, you and I are in agreement on that. There..."

Washington: "...people are getting charged estimated bills for services that haven't been connected..."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Bost: "All right."

Washington: "...or they have to pay rate."

Bost: "And I... and I don't..."

Washington: "So, knowing that the… the value of a dollar for a family business could go to other uses other than pay for something they did not get."

Bost: "You and I do not disagree on that. What we want to make sure of, though is, is in this language that now if they are at the request of the customer... quite often they say go ahead and hook the meter up which is, I think, there was an argument that they said that that comes to be... if you hook the meter up and then you're not hooking... you put the meter in place but you're not drawing anything out of that, there may be a meter charge. Can they still charge that meter and not the... not the commodity that's passed through, according to this?"

Washington: "To my understanding the answer is yes."

Bost: "Okay. Okay. It... it... will this negatively affect any way, you know, a lot of times these gas companies will come out and read the meter one month and then not read if the next based on an estimate. Does that affect any of the other customers in the way that this is written?"

Washington: "This is to protect the customers."

Bost: "No, no, no. I'm not disagreeing with that. I just want to make sure that this language doesn't actually hurt the customer in a way that the… now, all of a sudden, many people like to be able to have estimated readings so that… that sometimes it'll end up being less."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Washington: "It does not affect the customers in any other way and if you notice, and I'm sure you already have, that there is no position taken by any of the utility company that you're advocating your question."

Bost: "Oh, I understand that, but I mean, even if there's not a position or anything, I know... as we work through this, I just want to make sure the language is correct because I've watched how we... how we move this language around and I'm very concerned about it."

Washington: "Well, Representative, I don't think you would be more concerned than the utility company who put the money in their pockets and being that they have no position, that quite... that quite is self-explanatory, I would think."

Bost: "Well, Representative, I've seen a lot of times that people doing that... do not testify in committee for other reasons, but I'm not claiming that that's here. I'm just wanting to make sure the language was correct, because when the Bill was first brought up we did a lot of work to make sure that the language was correct. What I'm looking at..."

Washington: "And eventually no position states that that language was satisfactory to the interests of those that we're talking about here today."

Bost: "Thank you, Representative."

Washington: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Flider."

Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Flider: "Thank you. Representative, this seems to me like a pretty clear cut kind of solution to an issue that you probably found in your district, which, I think, would have been a problem. And that is that somebody moves into a house, there may already have been service and then they get an estimated bill as if they had had a month of service already and they never even used the… a therm or a kilowatt hour of service. Is that correct?"

Washington: "Yes, Sir."

Flider: "And then in the instance of somebody who builds a house and they were to move in and then they, in this case, it prohibits the utility from providing them an estimated bill, which would estimate that they may use a hundred (100) or two hundred (200) therms or three hundred (300) or five hundred (500) kilowatt hours before they every used it, so this makes sure that the utility can't do that as well. Is that correct?"

Washington: "Yes, Sir."

Flider: "Okay. I think it's a great Bill. Thank you."

Washington: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Mautino."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black. Representative Black's light's on; I don't see Representative Black. Representative Black, you seek recognition?"

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I do appreciate your indulgence. I'm sorry. I got delayed out in the hall. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Sponsor is a well-intentioned and we talked when he first brought this Bill and if, in fact, what happened to

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

him and his gas meter happened, that's an egregious abuse of the utility company. And I... I think he would probably be able to get that straightened out with the gas company. know I would certainly try my best and I'd be more than happy to help him, if he, in fact, was receiving estimated bills before he took physical possession of the property and actually moved in. But the question that I raised and in response to another speaker, this isn't as clear-cut as it sounds. And I think Representative Bost pointed out that the definition of 'utility' is far more than gas. And... and the question I raised when the Gentleman first presented this Bill was in the case of a construction, having grown up around that business, the contractor will often set a post, 4x4, the utility company, the electric company comes out, runs a service line, puts in a temporary meter to that post and then drops the electric service and the contractor can tap into that electric service to run all of the electrical equipment that he or she needs to build the house: power saws, whatever that equipment might be. And as I mentioned previously, that... who pays for that power is generally between the builder and the owner of the house. If it's a spec house, obviously, the builder pays all the electricity. But if it's... if it's being built for the Sponsor of the Bill, then the contractor may, in his contract, say at such and such a point you're going to pay the electric bill on the house even though the meter may not be permanently affixed to the weatherhead and the house to make it a completed electric installation. I think this Bill may disturb that particular long-standing practice of using a

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

temporary electric service drop, that it's just simply common practice in the construction industry. I share his concern on the gas and the utility giving him an estimated That... I don't even see how in the world that could happen or why the utility company... the gas company wouldn't have immediately given full credit and if they didn't, they If I were an attorney, I'd offer to represent the Gentleman in such a case. But even in the case of a gas meter that is often set before the house is occupied, again, standard practice is that once the gas meter is in place, even though the gas line may not be hooked up to the actual house, you begin to incur what we call a meter service charge, in other words, you're renting that gas meter from the utility company. It may have been that confusion; it may have been a computer error and I certainly stand in and total empathy with what happened complete Representative Washington. But it's not as simple as this Bill would point out and a previous speaker pointed out. I am concerned about what we do with a temporary electric drop. I am concerned with how it impacts the setting of a... of a gas meter. And in sometimes, the construction company will get permission from the gas company to tap into that so that they can run a temporary furnace in the house so they can work on drywall during the winter. I mean, there's all kinds of... of things that happen in the construction business. What happened to Representative Washington, from what he tells me, was absolutely wrong. If he didn't get a full refund, he should. But I can't in good conscience vote for the Bill even though I think Representative Washington

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

was certainly wronged by the gas company, in this case, because I just simply don't know what this does to the long-standing practice of a temporary connection. I've even seen temporary connections on the water line so the contractor could use the water line for landscaping purposes or to put down sod or whatever. And I think the Bill may create more difficulties because the word 'utility' means more than just gas. So, in all due respect to the Sponsor, I intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Washington to close."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Members for their comments. And urge a positive passage of this legislation."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 1563 pass?'
All those in favor should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote
'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have
all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Representative Mulligan. Rosemary,
Rosemary Mulligan. Mr. Clerk... Mr. Clerk, take the record.
On this Bill, there are 83 Members voting 'yes', 30 voting
'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
Representative Soto, you have House Bill 1744. Read the
Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1744, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Cindy Soto."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Soto: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1744 amends the Right to Privacy at the Workplace Act. Provides that the employers are prohibited from enrolling in any Employment Eligibility Verification System, including the Basic Pilot program, as authorized by Federal Law until the Social Security Administration and Department of Homeland Security databases are able to make a determination on 99 percent of the tentative nonconfirmation notices issued to the employer within three (3) days, unless otherwise required by Federal Law. And I urge an 'aye' vote and open for any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Anyone seeking recognition regarding House Bill 1744? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 1744 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Krause. Representative Osterman. Carolyn. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 76 Members voting 'yes', 39 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Schock, you have House Bill 1708. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1708, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schock."
- Schock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1708, in my opinion's, long overdue. It seeks to increase the income eligibility, which was originally set in this Act back in

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

1989 and has been... and not been increased since then. It increases it from a household income of fifty thousand (50,000) to sixty-five thousand (65,000) now. Be happy to answer any questions that Members might have. And I urge a 'yes' vote."

- Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion on House Bill 1708? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 1708 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunn. Representative Sullivan. Representative Watson. Ed, somebody votin' your switch? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sommer. Representative Keith Sommer. Representative Sullivan, House Bill 132. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 132, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Ed Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this Bill will do is allow the court, specifically a judge, to require a person convicted of domestic abuse to attend a partner abuse intervention program. Under the Amendment, we made this permissive to allow the court to order this as opposed to mandating it. I'm... look forward to any questions."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Speaker Lyons: "Anybody seeking any recognition regarding House Bill 132? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 132 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Golar. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Tracy, you have House Bill 3628. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3628, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes... recommend... Representative Tracy."
- Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... this Bill recently had a Floor Amendment, which removed any prior opposition. But what this Bill would do would provide that road state funds... Well, let me back up. First, what it would do is to provide that no appropriations made from the Road Fund may be made to any state agency or the Court of Claims in fiscal year '08 or thereafter. And it provides that no transfers may be made from the Road Fund or the state construction account to the General Revenue Fund."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is anyone seeking... Representative Tracy, finished with your presentation? Is anybody seeking recognition regarding House Bill 3628? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 3628 pass?' All those in favor should signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Feigenholtz. Flowers. Granberg. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Tryon, you have House Bill 909. Mr. Clerk, read... read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 909, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Mike Tryon."
- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 909... there's an Amendment that corrects language in the Community Mental Health Act... makes this language consistent with federal and state terminology in many of the grant programs that we... we run and it also codifies the existing practice as it relates to developmentally disabled citizens and citizens afflicted with mental illness. There is no opposition as amended and I would urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "As there's no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Should House Bill 909 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Jerry Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Representative Tryon, you also have House Bill 576. Mike. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 576, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 576 is a Bill that we passed out of the House last year unanimously. What this Bill does is it applies to schools' districts whose boundaries are in more than one county. And it specifically applies to a tax extension that is estimated by one of the counties and then when the county corrects it or reconciles their books, has a different figure. And when that happens, the reconciliation happens a year later. This will require ISBE to use the reconciled amount that is given by the clerk and therefore, no school district would lose any of its money due to a clerical error on the county clerk's part. If there are any questions, I'd be glad to answer them."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 576? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 576 pass?' All those in favor should signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flider, and Representative McCarthy. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this... on House Bill 576, 116 Members voted 'yes', 0 voted 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Wait, you have House Bill 271. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 271, a Bill for an Act concerning alternative fuels. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Boone, Representative Wait."
- Wait: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Yes. House Bill 271 simply says that we should try to promote biodiesel and ethanol. Just says that the state computer should be hypertexted together so that they could easily find the promotion of it. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking recognition on House Bill 271.

 The question is, 'Should House Bill 271 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative May. Representative Granberg. Representative Ryg. Would you like to be recorded? Granberg, Ryg. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ron Wait, you also have House Bill 273. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 273, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ron Wait."
- Wait: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 273 simply says that, as you know, we're promoting a lot of biodiesel in the State of Illinois. This says simply we should put a sticker on the pumps similar to what we did

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- with E85 and E10... know what percent of biodiesel you are pumping. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is no one seeking recognition? The question is, 'Should House Bill 273 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mathias, you're recognized on a Motion."
- Mathias: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, as one of the prevailing parties, on House Bill 1795, I vote to reconsider the vote on House Bill 1795."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mathias moves to, under Rule 61, to... having voted on the prevailing side, to reconsider House Bill 1795. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harry Osterman."
- Osterman: "I'm missing some people. I'm missing some people. I would ask the ruling of the Chair as to... how to proceed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, the standard rules of the House on your Bill would take 60 votes for your Bill to pass the chamber on the Motion. And the Motion will take 60 votes."
- Osterman: "So, do we debate the Bill again, do we vote on the Bill... vote on the Motion?"
- Speaker Lyons: "This'll be a vote on the Motion to reconsider the Bill, Representative."
- Osterman: "I would simply ask for a 'no' vote on the Motion to reconsider."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Lyons: "So, the question is, Ladies and Gentlemen, 'Should the Motion to reconsider House Bill 1795 pass?' All those in favor of the Motion to reconsider should vote 'yes'; those opposed should vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Mr. Black, you seeking recognition?"

Black: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was seeking recognition before you called the vote. Since the Member on your side of the aisle got to urge everyone to vote 'no', I would have liked to have had the opportunity to ask them to vote 'yes' and I didn't get that opportunity. But I see nine Democrats changed their mind, so we won't reconsider what I think is the most egregious rape of business in this state in the last twenty (20) years. And you know, one of the reasons we could avoid this if everybody would stay in their seat and vote their own switch. And I'm going to give some Members on my side of the aisle hell when we have a caucus and you don't have enough guts to tell a Member that you're going to vote 'yes' on a Bill when you're asked to vote 'no' and then you come up here and ya screw us. The hell with ya."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Just a point on this Bill. In going around and asking some Members why they voted, I found many Members who were back eating lunch. The fact that we can no longer eat on the House Floor or do anything makes it very difficult when you're rolling Bills like this. This was a Bill that impacted a whole lot of issues not just a union issue or a partisan issue; this impacts a great deal of law in Illinois. It impacts school districts, municipalities.

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

People that voted on this, some of the votes were really strange. Part of the reason they were so strange is because they weren't in their seats. Now, I will tell you, this kind of way that we're doing or conducting business this year is way out of the norm of what we're doing to the people of the State of Illinois. This may have looked like a straight union issue, but this isn't. This is a major body of law that was changed. This was a huge issue that impacts all kinds of independent government. I don't under... and it impacts liability law to the nth degree and the fact that people could not be in their seats to eat lunch and had to go back at this hour because that's when they're just getting lunch, certainly makes a difference of who's voting switches. I think this is a really big issue of who can be there and how we can be on the House Floor or what's coming up with a Bill and how fast the Bills roll."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Mr. Speaker, we... it would be very sensible if we would allow this to be revoted on. There are concerns that we have from our side of the aisle. The former speaker spoke of that and the fact that because of the way the system is now set up, to protect the carpet, kill the people, protect the carpet. Whatever you do, make sure you're not out here to vote your switch. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the peoples' house and yes, it's nice and it's lovely and we've done a great job of fixing it up, but when people can't stay in their seat because you might get it dirty, out here, then there's a problem. And for us to set here and decide on a Bill that's as important as this, not to reconsider when

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Members on our side of the aisle as well as yours may not have understood what that Bill was because we're ramrodding things through here while people are trying to meet all the criteria set forth by the new carpet. The right way to reconsider this is to say... encourage everyone to vote to reconsider, allow us the opportunity to truly debate this with everybody on the floor. This isn't a small Bill; this is a huge Bill. It affects every mom and pop business; it affects we the people of the State of Illinois. And I don't believe you, Mr. Speaker, want to go through this in this way and say that we don't really care about them. Regardless of how you voted on the Bill, we need to reconsider this vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been here for twenty (20) years and we've addressed a lot of important issues. There is no doubt that when this vote came up a lot of us were confused. I, for one... Yeah, I understand we have House Rules, but I eat my lunch right here. I've been here for twenty (20) years; I'm a grownup now, okay. I know whether to spill stuff on the carpet or not. With all due respect, to all of those who labored so hard to renovate our chamber, this is a working Body. It's what? It's almost 2:00. I've decided to have lunch. I decided to eat here at my desk. If I offended any of you, I apologize. But next week I'll be eating my lunch again, right here, probably two or three hours late like you. We are a working Body; we're on Third Reading. We don't need to be going to the backroom in order to say, well, we didn't want to spill anything on

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

the carpet. There is no doubt in my mind that many of us... many Members were confused about the most recent vote. I think we should dump the Roll Call and start all over again. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "I'd like a Republican Caucus immediately, Room 114."

Speaker Lyons: "On the Motion, there are 51 'yeas', 65 'nays'.

The Motion fails. Representative Riley."

Riley: "Every day, you know, there's... there's individuals who work for IDES that go out and do audits of all of the businesses in the State of Illinois. No, I was in the back. And what they do is they try to find out whether or not people are being misclassified as a part of what they do on a daily basis. So, to say that no one understands the process of the Bill, I think is... is somewhat of a stretch. People do understand it. And what they're trying to do is to find out revenues that really should be going to this state, simply said."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Leitch. Representative Leitch was asked for a Republican Caucus. Representative Black, we'll put your microphone on. You can speak to the last speaker."

Black: "Well, hallelujah. I'm not an independent contractor but I still have a right. If the Gentleman's correct and IDES goes out and does all of these wonderful audits to collect money for the State of Illinois and it goes into a certain fund and then the Governor sweeps it so he can do... put gasoline in his airplane and fly all across the state and call us drunken sailors and what have you, this man just

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

answered the question as to why the Bill isn't necessary. If IDES already has the power which we agreed to eighteen (18) years ago, they're the ones who go out and do the audit, they're the ones who decide, why do you need the You've got a captive state agency that goes out and paralyzes business and runs 'em out of the state, isn't that enough? The Gentleman was right on target. It's IDES's job and we agreed to that years ago and they're doin' their job, but that isn't good enough for you. Now, you got to pass a Bill. You know, if we're not ... if we're going to keep up with this damn dictatorship, then at least give us an hour This thing is ridiculous. You can't eat on the for lunch. floor; you can't spill anything on the floor; you can't drink; you can't speak; you can't think for yourself because we've got Leaders to think for us. Leaders to tell us what to do and in some cases, Leaders who don't tell us what to do and then we're completely lost. Then we got to go do it again. By God, I don't know about you but the people in my district elected me and I'll stand on my own two feet and I'll cast my vote and if you want to run this place like a banana republic and you're happy with it, then go ahead and do it. I told ya months ago when you voted for your rules, you'd rue the day. Well, you keep votin' for the same rules year after year and then you wonder why you can't get anything done. And we wonder why we can't get anything It's because we're not in any representative democracy; we're in a total, complete dictatorship. I've had eight (8) Bills that your side of the aisle told me would not be called, would not have a

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- committee hearing. What the heck kind of representative democracy is that? If you don't like a Bill brought to me by a constituent, send it to committee and vote it down. But no, you come out here and tell me I'm not even allowed to have a committee hearing. Ya oughta really be proud of the democracy you've helped create."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Republicans will caucus in Room 118 for approximately 45 minutes. Leader Cross, 45 minutes in Room 118. Representative... The House will stand at ease to the call of the Chair. The House shall come to order. We'll be returning to the alphabetical list of Thrid Readings and the first Bill that we'll be discussing will be. Representative... Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With leave of the Body, we'd like to report that we have an excused absence for the rest of the day for Representative Schmitz and Stephens."
- Speaker Lyons: "Be so recorded, Representative. Thank you.

 Representative David Phelps... Representative Phelps, Brandon
 Phelps, you have a House Bill 988. Out of the record.

 Representative Berrios, you have House Bill 984. Read the
 Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 984, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Toni Berrios."
- Berrios: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This... House Bill 984 is a cleanup Bill. It's cleaning up a statute that was mandated for DCFS in 1989. The mandate has been met, but every time they get audited

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

this question pops up. So, we're just cleaning up the statute and they're not deleting the concept because DCFS still does the report. They just don't want it in the statute. I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Any questions on House Bill 984? The Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Mulligan: "Representative, explain once again exactly what this is doing. Are we doing this at the request of who?"

Berrios: "DCFS asked me to present this Bill."

Mulligan: "And what does it do?"

Berrios: "It just deletes... It repeals a section in their statute just because of the time limitations on there. It was a study that they had to do."

Mulligan: "In 1989?"

Berrios: "Yes."

Mulligan: "All right. But it also... it conducts a study in relationship... says to the development of a plan to train persons required to report suspected child abuse. I presume that people come and go, judges... there are new judges, there are new people that are in positions. So, now they're not training anyone?"

Berrios: "No, there's..."

Mulligan: "There have to be mandated reporters on what the issues are and how you report or why you would report?"

Berrios: "They still do the trainings and they said they don't want to delete the concept because it's something they do, it's just they want it out of the statute because every time

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

they get audited this question comes up and they have the information, it's just they get attacked for it."

Mulligan: "Actually, I must say the audits this year in Human Services are the worst I've ever seen in fifteen (15) years of I've been... I've been being here. The audits for the Human Service Agencies are horrible. Now, if this is one thing, that DCFS audit was pages. So, I'm just curious as to exactly why a concept is not being... accept as a concept. It's not something that they're obligated to do and I would think training of individuals who are mandated reporters or people that are dealing with as such as judges are important. So, are they going to have a concept or are they obligated in some way to continue doing this?"

Berrios: "I'm really not too sure, Representative."

Mulligan: "Well, I don't find what's happening in these areas to be particularly wonderful for the state or for the people that we represent. And since there was a special committee this year that did nothing else but look at DCFS oversight because of the problems that they're having downstate, the reason I'm questioning you is because I was not on the committee that saw this Bill come through, but I do know that their audit was not so hot. And that we've had a lot of changes at DCFS and that they're understaffed downstate and they've not hired the employees to actually do the follow-up on some of the things that have been happening. So, when you're saying that you're changing it, the only thing in here that looks halfway decent to me is that supposedly the office of the Inspector General, who I respect very much and has been the Inspector General since

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

the inception of the concept of an Inspector General, has recommended this and that might be the only way I would vote for it. But what I'm curious as to how are they going to follow up to continue in training or who do they expect to do the training? New judges, new social workers, new people, they have to be mandate... mandated reporters. How are they going to accomplish this and is this just taking out something that said a report had to be published by a certain date or is it taking away their mission to do this?"

Berrios: "I can give you the reason for the proposal. Will that... It says..."

Mulligan: "Well, the reason is the report was supposed to be at a certain time and it's past that date?"

Berrios: "Yeah. It was in 1989. And then as these reports...
like the state mandates relating to the department have not
been updated. So, as these reports have due dates going
back some years and the reports can no longer be located,
audit reports issued since 2002 by the Auditor General's
Office have recommended the statutes be updated or repealed.
They were one-time only reports so that's why they just want
to repeal this part."

Mulligan: "All right. Just for legislative intent. My staff tells me that they still collect this data and that they're obligated to collect it. They're just not obligated to do the 1989 report?"

Berrios: "Right."

Mulligan: "Are you sure? Because I'm asking you to put it into legislative intent. So, since you are not the department and I see that you've been put in this spot as not actually

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

knowing for sure and much as I hate to ask you to take the Bill out of the record, I would just like someone from the department to come and reassure me that actually this is what they intend to do and although all they're asking you to do is take out the part about the 1989 report as opposed to not doing that and since there's Members on your side of the aisle and our side of the aisle that showed great concern over DCFS this year, I would like very much to have that happen."

Berrios: "I'll do that. I'll take it out of the record..."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk..."

Berrios: "...and we can get that question answered."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take this Bill out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Will Davis, you have House Bill 1675. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1675, a Bill for an Act concerning state employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1675 creates the State Employment Credit Check Act to provide that if a credit check is required by a state agency as part of the employment application process, that the credit check must be conducted during the interview process and not at the end of the process as it generally is. I simply feel that if that that's a necessary part of the application process and that in and of itself that something can... that can disqualify an individual, that we give them the opportunity to possibly have that disqualification on the front end versus the back end so if

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

they are disqualified, they can, of course, move on to try to seek other employment. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Jim Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "He indicates he will."

Meyer: "Representative, I understand what you're trying to do, it's that... it's just that in my previous life before coming down here, I worked in management for sixteen (16) years where I did a lot of hiring and it seems to me that you wouldn't want to go through the expense of a credit check, which I would believe to be... which I know is cla... is a fair amount of money that a business would or a government would have to put out in order to run that credit check if you're not really interested in hiring the individual. And it seems to me that it would be a good process to first get your selection down to two or three or one or whatever that number is before you go to the expense. Do you disa... I would assume you're disagreeing with that and I'm just asking why."

Davis, W.: "Well, origin... the original Bill, Representative, indicated that that process would actually take place when an applicant applies for a job. We amended the Bill and this is what was brought to me by CMS so that the credit check will take place if the individual comes up for an interview. So, that drastically reduces the pool."

Meyer: "Okay. I... If they come up for an interview, but still the interview itself is a process where you narrow

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

down your selection. You might talk to fifteen (15) people, would you not or do you only interview one (1)?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I guess that depends on the job and those individuals that apply and whether or not they meet basic criteria, Representative."

Meyer: "Well, I... I..."

Davis, W.: "But... but this language..."

Meyer: "Okay."

Davis, W.: "...the... the... again, the... the Amendment was brought to me by CMS because I think they felt exactly what you felt, about having a broad pool of individuals who you may not be interested in or may not meet the criteria. So, again, we amended the Bill so to move that to the... if they go up for an interview versus at the beginning of the process. Which again, we feel this drastically reduces that number of individuals and again, this is the language that was brought to me by CMS."

Meyer: "Okay. So, while some of the... I guess some of the confusion comes from the fact you're saying CMS is bringing this language to you, but my... my analysis or at least indicates that CMS opposes it and they'd slipped it."

Davis, W.: "Well, again, I think... I think... I know they opposed the original version of it, but in... in committee they had some suggestions and their suggestion was that we move it from beginning or application to interview. Now, whether or not they still have the same opposition, I don't know, Sir."

Meyer: "Well, again, my... my indication is that they still oppose it due to the cost and I... even if we're going to vote on this Bill today, I think the Membership should realize that

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

CMS does oppose this. They feel there will be cost to it... costly to them. And if they have other... other suggestions, maybe you'd like to work with 'em to bring their other suggestions to us because right now it looks like it... they oppose it as it's written."

Davis, W.: "Representative, this... this was their suggestion. So, again, whether or not they still have the same opposition, I don't know what that process is to remove opposition but yes, they were opposed to the original Bill. We talked. They came to me and this was the language that they proposed. If they weren't interested in doing it, then they very well could have just said, you know what, we don't like it, we aren't going to work with you and we're just simply opposed to it. But what was brought in the Amendment that was filed and subsequently passed or adopted to this Bill was brought by CMS. Now, if they have additional concerns, be more than happy to work with them in the Senate. That's not a problem."

Meyer: "Could you pull this from the record just... just so we can find out from them, are they still opposed to their own language?"

Davis, W.: "Well, again, if... if they still are opposed to it, then if they have any additional concerns and... Okay. I'm sorry. We... we just got a notice that they are indeed still opposed to the Bill. But again, the change that was made was their language but apparently they are still opposed to the Bill and that... and that's fine."

Meyer: "Okay. Well, then... Okay."

Davis, W.: "And that's fine."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Meyer: "I understand then and I just stand in opposition to it.

Thank you."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis to close."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the Gentleman's concerns. If CMS has, you know, any ideas on how to further amend it, I'll be more than happy to work with them in the Senate. But again, I know for my constituents' sake, again, they would rather know early on in the process whether or not they can be considered for a job versus at the end... toward the end of the process and they run a credit check and unfortunately, individuals are in some of these situations because their... they don't have employment. Maybe they've had a job and they've been doing very well, but they lost the job for whatever reason and they've had to deal with a number of different issues which may indeed impact their credit. So, if that is indeed the case and an individual is going to be affected by this process, I think they would rather know it a little earlier on in the process so they can continue to seek employment versus the hope and dreams of getting a job and then to find out at the very end that, oh well, your credit is too bad, you can't have a job. Go, you know, go do something else. So, I, again, appreciate the Gentleman's concerns. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 1675 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Representative Cole. Mulligan. Representative Mulligan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 62 Members voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Pihos, you have House Bill 1289. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1289, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Pihos."

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1289 adds to the list of aggravating factors which will be accorded weight in favor of imposing a term of imprisonment or may be considered by the court as reasons to impose a more severe sentence, if the defendant committed the offense of financial exploitation of an elder person or a person with a disability. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "As no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Should House Bill 1289 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yea'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill... this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sacia, you have House Bill 502. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 502, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 502 was brought to me by a sergeant in the Illinois State Police, Keith Owanu, who is a member of a nationally recognized military reenacted... The request is that we allow individual organization. weapons to be the exact reproduction as they were at the time and the era that they are representing. Example would be a World War II Thompson machine gun semiautomatic machine gun would be that length as opposed to the more lengthy requirement of today's statutes. Again, it's very important for everyone to understand that this is strictly for a recognized member of a military reenactment organization. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Graham."

Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor will yield."

Graham: "Representative Sacia, just for clarity. Now, will these..."

Sacia: "Weapons."

Graham: "...weapons are... they're just for a special group?"

Sacia: "Yes... yes, Ma'am."

Graham: "And they're not going to be sold in the... the stores?"

Sacia: "Not at all. They can on..."

Graham: "What do these... I'm sorry, go ahead."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Sacia: "No, they can only be possessed by members of the licensed, organized reenactment organization and they can only be transported to and from the reenactment point. In other words, they can't use them for hunting. They can't use them for anything other than their specific function, which is a military reenactment function."

Graham: "Now, what type of guns were you referring to?"

Sacia: "Well, you would have... Let's use World War II as an example. If you had... and first of all, I need to clarify, there would be no fully automatic weapons here. This would be strictly single fire or semiautomatic, meaning single fire weapons and they could not be machine guns or anything such as that. They're only weapons and the purpose of it is to get the shorter weapons but they still would be no shorter than what is now legally required which is twenty-six (26) total inches in length."

Graham: "Question: now, will these weapons be actual weapons that can discharge? What... you know..."

Sacia: "Yes."

Graham: "...you know, are they..."

Sacia: "Yes. Can they be fired?"

Graham: "...are they mock weapons?"

Sacia: "Yes."

Graham: "They... they are. So..."

Sacia: "They could be fired."

Graham: "So, what sort of demonstration will they be going to, I guess, to exhibit, I guess, some time of era... some time frame and they would actually use these weapons, you know, discharge 'em if they were, you know..."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Sacia: "That would be correct. Yes, Representative Graham. But again, do understand there are no fully automatic weapons here. They must comply with all regulations. Basically, it's just to obtain the shorter length. I guess the best example I can give you is paratroopers of World War II carried a shorter weapon barrel and they want to be able to utilize that shorter barrel length."

Graham: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Lang: "Representative, I don't think I have too much of a problem with your Bill but I do have a couple of questions."

Sacia: "Yes, Sir."

Lang: "So, tell us what these reenactors do and how they do it?"

Sacia: "Surely. They... they dress in the uniform of the era, in other words, World War II. Let's use German, Japanese, and American uniforms. They try to be totally historically accurate. They have the military vehicles, the military clothing and the military weapons and then they put on a little reenactment of what a battle perhaps would have been like back in the '40s."

Lang: "And so, these reenactments do… are these live guns with live ammunition?"

Sacia: "They could... they are live weapons but whether or not they're using live ammunition would be determined by the reenacting group. In other words, if they were coming at one another, they would not be using live ammunition. If

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

they were doing a display of how the weapons fired, it would be in a area, which was a regular range much as is used today."

Lang: "Well, who would be in possession of the weapons? Would it be the individual actors, if you will, who are doing the reenactment or would the weapons be in the possession and ownership of the company or group that's doing the reenactment?"

Sacia: "The reenactors themselves, if they are a licensed, registered member of a licensed and bona fide reenactment group. So, it would be like if you were one, Representative Lang, it would be your responsibility to care for the weapon."

Lang: "And so, each individual person who is in the group would take care of a weapon?"

Sacia: "Yes, Sir."

Lang: "And so, we would be turning over live weapons which would... which could be shortened in ways that would not be legal outside of the reenactment, then these people would have these guns in their possession in their homes in between the reenactments."

Sacia: "Please understand, Representative Lang, they currently do. Now, let's say it's got a 20-inch barrel and the weapon of the era was an 18-inch barrel, then it could be, I suppose, modified or obtaining one that did have the 18-inch barrel. But they do already have that authority, Sir."

Lang: "They... they have the authority to have the weapon..."

Sacia: "Yes, Sir."

Lang: "...but you need this Bill because to be..."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Sacia: "Authentic."

Lang: "...authentic and genuine they need perhaps shorter barrels which are not legal today."

Sacia: "That's correct, Sir."

Lang: "And so... Let me go back where I was. They would be taking weapons back to their home that are not legal today under any other purpose. Is that correct?"

Sacia: "You are absolutely correct, Sir."

Lang: "And so then I would presume these people have to have FOID cards if they have weapons."

Sacia: "Correct."

Lang: "But what is to keep these people from using these weapons in other ways? They... So, they could... they could take a weapon... let's... they could take a weapon that would be legal for other purposes and have it in their home but now you've got a weapon that's illegal for other purposes, basically out on the streets of Illinois. Does this concern you at all?"

Sacia: "Well, any other use for that weapon would be illegal, Representative Lang, any other use. So..."

Lang: "All right. What... Go ahead."

Sacia: "No. I just was going to say, they are possessing a weapon now. Again, let me use the example of a 20-inch barrel but the one that they need for authentic purposes has a 2-inch shorter barrel. And they would then have the right to possess that weapon in their home with their other gear that they use for their demonstration purposes."

Lang: "Does the Bill say that they could not use this weapon for any other purpose other than the reenactment?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Sacia: "Yes, Sir. Specifically..."

Lang: "Can you tell me where that is in the Bill?"

Sacia: "Could you give me just a moment, Sir?"

Lang: "Surely."

Sacia: "Representative Lang, if I could call your attention to page 9, under paragraph 7, the very last three lines, if I might read. 'Modified is not less than twenty (20) inch... twenty-six (26) inches and the vintage rifle or modern reproduction, thereof, is used only during the historical reenactment.'"

Lang: "Thank you. Are there any penalties for doing something other than that?"

Sacia: "The existing penalties that are already out there for illegal use of a firearm, Sir."

Lang: "All right. One other question. I need just one more minute, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "There's still... Mr. Lang, we'll give you one more minute..."

Lang: "Thank..."

Speaker Lyons: "...to finish your..."

Lang: "...thank you very much. I did not see any definition in the Bill of 'historical reenactors' or whatever the exact term is. Is there... am I... am I missing that? Is there a definition of what this group is so we know who... who has the right to do this?"

Sacia: "Representative Lang, I don't specifically have it in front of me, but they have to be members of a bona fide organization which must be licensed and registered. Though

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

I don't have that spelled out in front of me, they must be part of a legitimate, recognized organization, Sir."

Lang: "And is that in the statute someplace?"

Sacia: "No, Sir."

Lang: "So... so..."

Sacia: "We referred to it as the… the bona fide reenactors. If I may, 'an active member of a bona fide nationally recognized military reenactment group.'"

Lang: "I understand. I see that, but there..."

Sacia: "Okay."

Lang: "You will agree with me that there's no definition of that in here."

Sacia: "I certainly do, Sir."

Lang: "All right."

Sacia: "I certainly do."

Lang: "So, I'm prepared to vote for your Bill. I can see why this would be interesting for people, but I would urge you strongly to have... when this Bill gets to the Senate... to put some definitions in here so we know who can have these weapons and who cannot have these weapons."

Sacia: "And I appreciate that and I give you that promise, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill was on Short Debate and we'll put it on Standard Debate. Mr. Graham... Miss Graham and Mr. Lang have spoken in response to it. Mr. Black, the Gentleman from Vermilion. Mr. Black passes. Representative Riley."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Riley: "This a question that... Well, will the Sponsor please yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Of course."

Riley: "This is a technical question 'cause I'm really familiar with reenactments that deal with the Civil War. Not so much later conflicts and as you know, different kinds of weapons, you know, were used in the later conflicts."

Sacia: "Yes, Sir."

Riley: "Can you give me an idea of the kinds of weapons that would come under your legislation?"

Sacia: "One example would be the paratrooper version of the M1 rifle that was carried in World War II or the tanker model would be a better example. I personally own two M1 rifles, but the..."

Riley: "The M1 carbine?"

Sacia: "No, not the kind..."

Riley: "The M1-A1."

Sacia: "Not... not the carbine, Sir. The full length M1..."

Riley: "Oh."

Sacia: "...carried by 95 percent of the soldiers of World War II and the Korean..."

Riley: "The M1 Garand."

Sacia: "The M1 Garand, yes, Sir."

Riley: "Okay."

Sacia: "There was a shortened version called the tanker model.

That would have been carried by those in Patton's crews and so forth."

Riley: "Okay."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Sacia: "That would be the best example I could think of."

Riley: "Okay. So, you're not talking about the… the carbine M1- A1, the M… the M… the M2?"

Sacia: "You... you are correct, Sir. I... I think the existing M1 carbine, A1 and the A2s, is that correct?"

Riley: "Yes."

Sacia: "Or M1 and M2s, but regardless, I think the ones that are out there right now do meet the criteria. I believe, Sir. I... I could be incorrect, but I think the carbines that are out there today meet the minimum length requirement and are already exempted. But I do believe the tanker model of the M1 Garand is one example, I believe."

Riley: "Okay. Because I am somewhat concerned, as you know, I am sure you know about these things. Those carbines have in the past been modified to make them fully automatic."

Sacia: "I am aware of that, Sir, and those weapons, as you know, even if you shorten them or even as they exist out there today, they're already out there and we're not asking to change anything other than, again, and I don't believe it pertains to this specific weapon you're talking with, but that modification issue still remains an issue, Sir."

Riley: "Also, along with what Representative Lang said, I am concerned... I don't know how loose or how tight the regulations of recognized reenact... reenactors are. I know there's another class of federal license for people who collect weapons, but I think that there has to be some specificity as to what groups would be typified as being military reenactors because there's a lot of groups out

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

there that I don't think any of us would agree that we would want to come under this legislation."

Sacia: "And I... and I completely agree with you. And you have my word as well as... as my word to Representative Lang that I'm going to find some... some specific language to identify and obviously, it'll hopefully come back here on concurrence where I can share that with you what a bona fide, military reenactment organization specifically is."

Riley: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "I believe we've had two people speak in favor of the Bill and two ask questions on it. We have three speakers who are requesting opportunity to speak to the Bill. Representative Osterman, question?"

Osterman: "A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Osterman."

Osterman: "Representative Sacia, how does this legislation affect the transportation of these weapons from a home to a reenactment?"

Sacia: "They must be encased according to all current regulations for transporting any type of a firearm, Sir. They must meet all existing regulations. Nothing would change there."

Osterman: "On page 8, under Section 5 and at the bottom of page 8, there's language specifically that states, 'during transportation such weapons shall be broken down into a nonfunctioning state and not immediately accessible.' So, my question to you is, you're taking recommendations today. You've been very forthright in your answers to the questions. In an effort to make sure that the

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

transportation of these firearms is done in the right way, in a way that also protects the individual that you're trying to affect, what I would ask you to do is to specifically add that language when it goes to the Senate. I'm not asking you to hold the Bill. I'm not asking you to pull it from the record. I'm asking you and I take you on your word adding that language specifies further the transportation of how those weapons are so that they're not accessible, so that the people that are doing this know what they're doing and law enforcement, they may pull them over, understands this as well."

Sacia: "You have my word, Representative Osterman."

Osterman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Holbrook. A question or point of clarification."

Holbrook: "I have a... ask a question. Will the speak... will the speaker (sic-Sponsor) yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Holbrook: "We have several historic reenactments in our area. We even have the World War II and World War I. Our biggest are the French-Indian Wars and American Revolution 'cause we have the furthest west American Revolutionary site in the nation. And we even do Civil War reenactments: the Sons of the Confederacy and the Sons of the Union. You know, they roll out their 12-pound cannons and do their cavalry charges. They do all that sort of thing. Some of these, like down in Representative Reitz's area, we'll have fifteen, sixteen thousand (15,000-16,000) people show up and maybe five hundred (500) to a thousand (1,000) reenactors,

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

especially the French-Indian War time. Would they be covered under this also?"

Sacia: "If there were any weapons that specifically... that this criteria fell under, Tom, absolutely it would, but I... I can't... you know, typically, the weapons of that era were longer, as I recall, I mean, except for maybe a pistol, but I think that would come under the criteria of a handgun. I really believe the gentleman, the police sergeant that brought me the Bill, was specifically referring to the World War II and the Korean War era, however, it would be all encompassing the way it's drafted."

Holbrook: "Okay. 'Cause these reenactments are huge tourism draws."

Sacia: "Yes, Sir."

Holbrook: "We draw thirty, forty, fifty thousand (30,000, 40,000, 50,000) people down there for these things. When they attack the fort, you know, that sort of thing. Okay. You answered my questions, but if their... their weapons came under this criteria and their part of a national organized group, they would come under this even though they're not World War I or II or Korea?"

Sacia: "Yes, Sir."

Holbrook: "They would actually come under the French-Indian War organization or the Sons of the Confederacy or whatever."

Sacia: "Yes, Sir."

Holbrook: "Thank you so much. Thank you."

Sacia: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to be in violation of the... Sorry, I haven't paid attention.

I'd like to speak in favor of the Bill, if I could."

Speaker Lyons: "Proceed."

Black: "All right."

Speaker Lyons: "You're the last speaker, Repre..."

Black: "I... I'm somewhat amazed that evidently a number of people on the other side of the aisle have not seen nor attended one of these reenactments. I'm very happy that Representative Holbrook got up and talked about some of the Civil War and French and Indian War, the reenactors. have one every fall in my district of the Civil War and I'm going to put in a plug for my ancestors. I... I am related to two people in the Civil War, the only two brothers to ever receive the Medal of Honor, General John C. Black and his brother Captain William P. Black both have received the Medal of Honor for their service in the Civil War. And so, we have this Civil War enactment and some of the black powder rifles that Civil War enactors use costs... well, cost of hundreds if not thousands of dollars and you... That's all handled and they have artillery pieces as Representative Holbrook said. I've been to many of the World War II reenactments: the 60th anniversary of D-Day held out at the Vermilion County airport, some of the battles of World War II. These people invest a tremendous amount of money. They have authentic World War II era, 1942, '43, '44 jeeps. even have tanks. Some of them have purchased and restored Sherman tanks and other mechanical implements during World War II, which they will display not only statically but the

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

tanks and a lot of the mechanized equipment are in working condition and they will give you an example of how they might have been used at a particular battle and they can fire the seventy-five (75) millimeter cannon, obviously, with blanks of the Sherman tank and they will show how various battles were... were played out during World War II. These are very serious reenactors. I... I have full faith and trust in Representative Sacia, but generally most of the ones that I'm familiar with are, in fact, chartered by the State of Illinois and are registered. They keep very close tabs on their... on their weapons because they are, in fact, collectors' items and very expensive. So, I... I don't think you need to worry about this is some kind of expansion of World War II era weapons. The controls on them are quite strict. The police are often in attendance, not only for crowd control, but they want to make sure that the weapons they are carrying are weapons that meet the existing statutes. I.. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill and knowing him as I do, the Bill will certainly be tightened to any standard that any of you would... be more comfortable with. But these reenactments are held all around the state. I'm surprised more of you haven't seen them. They're very interesting. I don't think they pose any threat to public safety or whatsoever."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sacia to close."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would sup... I would really appreciate your 'aye' vote and I promise, Representative Osterman, I will certainly get the transportation language clarified. And to

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Representative Lang, the bona fide reenactment language, I will have available when it comes back from the Senate and I will share that information with the Senate Sponsor. Thank you."

- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 502 pass?'

 All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Franks, House Bill 374. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. On the Order of Postponed Consideration, Representative Franks has House Bill 374. Representative Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill we had up a few days ago and I've had a chance to speak with some of them... folks and I think we've... they understand the Bill better. And what we're doing here with the Family Medical Leave Act is allowing it to apply to in-laws as well as straight lineal descendants. I'll be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "He indicates he will."
- Black: "Representative, I... you think we can be much more calm today because I thought your point was well-taken, after the tirade the other day, was perhaps on a different subject,

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

but I think one of the problems we get into when we keep amending the Family Medical Leave Act... now what we're talking about in-laws..."

Franks: "Correct."

Black: "...and one of the unfortunate societal changes I've seen in my life are... there are often many divorces and remarriage... remarriages in society. I mean, is it specific to the existing mother-and father-in-law, not the mother-and father-in-law of two marriages ago?"

Franks: "Correct. Yes, Sir."

Black: "Okay. So, it's specific to that case. Now, and this is unpaid..."

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "...medical leave?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "Now, I'm trying to remember when we started this there was generally an exemption if you were working in a specific... I don't know what... an occupation or trade or a craft and the owner of the business said, 'you know, I just... I just can't let you go for six (6) weeks; I don't have anybody to take your place. Is that... did we ever work that out in some fashion?"

Franks: "Not that I'm aware of."

Black: "Well, I... I know we tried at one time. I... Well, I... well, I do appreciate the notice that it's the current inlaws. We don't have to go back two (2) or three (3) marriages ago. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I appreciate the Gentleman's forthright answers. I appreciate the fact that he's narrowed it considerably as to what constitutes the

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

definition of an 'in-law'. I... I do rise in reluctant opposition. I... because I don't know where we stop. I don't know how far... some families are certainly closer than others and one could argue that cousins and an aunt once removed and so forth and so on, so forth and so on, should be included in the Family Medical Leave Act. I... I know people who create business and create jobs and let people... not let people... but hire people to work for them are always concerned about their staffing level, particularly if it's a machine shop where the skill is of critical importance and to lose somebody for four (4) or five (5) weeks could mean that you don't fulfill a contract. I... I think Caterpillar has seventeen hundred (1700) suppliers in the State of Illinois and Caterpillar expects those machined parts to be there at the exact quality and at the exact quantity and on the exact date. I... I don't have a personal issue with this at all. I just... having been raised in a family-owned business I know that disruption can occur if you lose a critical employee. Businesses have that same concerns certainly don't want to deny anybody the right to attend to a family member who's ill. I know how difficult that is. My father was eighty-nine (89) and not in the health I wish was and my mother-in-law is ninety-five (95) certainly not in health that... that her daughter, my wife, would enjoy... would like to have her. But it ... every time we expand this, it does put a burden on the employer and so it's for that reason I rise in opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "This Bill is on Standard Debate, we've had one person talk in favor, one in response. We have three

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

speakers. Representative Jim Meyer, are you speaking in response to the Bill or in favor of the Bill?"

Meyer: "Going in response."

Speaker Lyons: "Proceed, Representative."

Meyer: "Would the Sponsor yield? Representative, under your Bill you open up the parameters of family leave to more members of the… to cover more members of the family unit and associated relatives. Is that correct?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir. It's the immediate family."

Meyer: "Let me ask you this. If I, as a care provider, would receive or would ask for family lea... family leave under the current law and... or the proposed law and it would cover somebody that's a direct family member, son or daughter, mother, or father, and I'm granted... I get twelve (12) weeks, correct?"

Franks: "Correct."

Meyer: "And I'm granted the twelve (12) weeks. I go back to work for a week and something happens to my son-in-law or daughter-in-law or father-in-law or mother-in-law and now I would, because of this expanded coverage law, I could go back and ask for another twelve (12) weeks?"

Franks: "No, Sir. No, Sir. It would still be only the twelve (12) weeks of unpaid job-protected leave per year. How you chose to apply that or to ask for it would be your discretion. You... It happens all the time. You have to have some flexibility. God forbid, your... your father should have a heart attack and you would have to take some... let's say he's a farmer. Okay. And you need to get the crops in this year. So, you say, you know what, I'm going to take

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- four (4) weeks now so I can help get the crops going. Then you go back to work. Then it might be an, God forbid, a child gets sick and you need to take some time off. You can do that as long as you're within the twelve (12) weeks per year. You don't get any extra time; it's the same amount of time, but you'll have the flexibility of if you can't take care of your father or your son, that your wife would be able to do so. That's all we're asking in this Bill."
- Meyer: "By doing this, how... under the current law, how many people are covered that I could... I would qualify for family leave?"
- Franks: "Right now, the way the law is, and we're not changing anything else, you have to be an employee of an employer that has fifty (50) or more employees to be eligible. So, the vast majority of the businesses in the state are not affected whatsoever."
- Meyer: "Well, if I'm an employee, how many potential people could I receive family leave in order to give care?"
- Franks: "That wouldn't change at all. It'd be... still be the exact same. It was... it just allows flexibility within a family to allow either you or your spouse to be the caregiver to either your parents or her parents or your children."
- Meyer: "Well, it still seems to me, from what I'm reading in the analysis at least, that we're expanding the number of people for which I would be eligible to give care under your proposal."
- Franks: "It would just be to your in-laws, that's all for you.

 The only extra people who you'd be able to help would be

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

your in-laws and as well as for your spouse, she'd be able to take care of your folks."

Meyer: "So, we're expanding it by up to four (4) people?"

Franks: "Yeah, two (2) on each side, assuming they're all alive."

Meyer: "I... I would just like to speak in opposition to this Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, business in this state is being a hard... a hardfast... hard-pressed now to meet competitive bills and expenses. It seems like every day we read about companies that are closing for various reasons. This just adds another reason for them to have a problem in being able to provide competitive products to the marketplace. And if you have a larger number or pool of people, it just adds an additional... additional people that would qualify you for this family leave. We all have families. We all want to have caregivers for those families, but by expanding that pool, I believe, that puts an undue... unnecessary burden on business. And Mr. Speaker, if... if this Bill passes, I would ask for a verification."

Speaker Lyons: "A verification request is so noted. We've had two people speak in response. We have room for one more person in response. Representative Bellock, speaking in response to the Bill..."

Bellock: "Yes."

Speaker Lyons: "...or in favor of?"

Bellock: "Yes, in response."

Speaker Lyons: "In response. Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Bellock: "Representative, in this Bill, would this allow you if you were an employee to use your accrued time off? For example, if you had taken the Family Leave Act for your son-in-law and had taken the 12-week period off, could you come back then and take your additional four (4) week off?"

You're only... We're not changing anything. You only get twelve (12) weeks per year. You're not going to get a day more, you're not going to get an hour more off. It's just giving you more flexibility to be realistic on what really happens in today's society. The previous speaker from Vermilion talked about that. We're not this ... it's not a one-person... Today's families, it's not a oneperson earner who goes out there and the other spouse stays That does not... that's not what it is anymore. middle class, in order to make ends meet, have both parents working or both spouses working. That's the reality of what we have in our society. This just gives flexibility. It's not allowing any more time off, not another minute. just letting people be able to manage their lives better that would help them and help their families get through a difficult time. The employers won't have any more exposure. The folks... the employees don't get any more time off. It's just dealing with the reality that we have that has been ignored and been swept under the rug."

Bellock: "All right. Thank you very much for your response.

And I certainly respect you for the issue that you've brought forward. I just have a problem with the expansion at this time with what we are having in Illinois right now

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

with jobs and taking the time off. So, at the time I have a problem supporting the Bill, but I respect what you're trying to do. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kosel, we've had three (3) people speak in response."

Kosel: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question on the Bill. I..."

Speaker Lyons: "For the purpose of a question. Proceed, Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Kosel: "Can you tell me, is there a limit as to how many people within a company can take advantage of this and is that number expanded by this Bill?"

Franks: "I don't know the answer. I don't think there's a limit. I just know that this only applies to companies that have fifty (50) or more employees."

Kosel: "Say, you talked to earlier about your law firm has fifty-(50) some employees, so you could have forty-five (45) people asking for this leave under this legislation? There's no limit. That says the first ten (10) that apply."

Franks: "We're not changing anything in the Family Medical Leave. We're not changing anything else."

Kosel: "Okay."

Franks: "So, I'm not..."

Kosel: "Still there is no limit on the number of ... "

Franks: "I'm not... No, I didn't say that."

Kosel: "Okay."

Franks: "I don't know, I said. I don't know that answer."

Kosel: "You don't know."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Franks: "I don't know whether there is, but we're not changing the Family Medical Leave Act at all to..."

Kosel: "Other then expanding..."

Franks: "Exactly."

Kosel: "...the number people."

Franks: "Right."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jakobsson, you speaking in favor of the Bill? You're the last..."

Jakobsson: "Yes."

Speaker Lyons: "...last speaker. Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. My mother-in-law lived with us for the last five (5) years of her life and in the last several months, she was in home hospice care. And certainly, my husband... his mother... spent a lot of time with her, but I did too, as well as our children. And I think this is very important because when families can be together they need to be together."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Franks to close."

Franks: "Thank you. I appreciate the comments from my friends on the other side of the aisle. What we have to remember, this isn't costing a company anything. The argument is, they're giving something for nothing, you're not, because right now every person has the ability to take off for up to twelve (12) weeks. We're not changing that. And should you choose to take off time to help a family member, you are not getting paid, not a penny. I think we have to accept the reality that there's not a one-earner family anymore in this state, it's a rarity. It's the exception, it's not the rule. And when this law was passed, it was the other way.

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Now, the reality is both mom and dad have to get out and work. The reality is mom and dad are often in the sandwich generation. They're helping their parents and they're helping their kids and they're trying to save for retirement and they're trying to pay the mortgage. They're trying to do all these things. Let's help our families. This isn't going to hurt any business, this is going to help business. This is going to allow people to be flexible. It's going to allow people not to have to quit their jobs. This is a Bill we all oughta be voting for. The arguments I heard, I know they were well-intentioned, but I... they're hollow. This will not hurt business, it will help business. And more importantly, it will help all of our families. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there's been a request for verification. I ask Members please vote their own switches. And on that note, the Motion is, 'Should House Bill 374 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flider, in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 62 Members voting 'yes', 50 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. Staff, I'd ask you to please retire to the rear of the chamber. A verification request has been made by Representative Meyer. Mr. Clerk, read those Members voting in the affirmative."

Clerk Mahoney: "Members voting in the affirmative: Acevedo;
Arroyo; Beiser; Berrios; Boland; John Bradley; Rich Bradley;
Brosnahan; Burke; Chapa LaVia; Collins; Colvin; Crespo;

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Currie; D'Amico; Monique Davis; Will Davis; Dugan; Feigenholtz; Flider; Flowers; Ford; Franks; Fritchey; Golar; Gordon; Graham; Granberg; Hamos; Hannig; Harris; Hernandez; Holbrook; Howard; Jakobsson; Jefferies; Jefferson; Joyce; Lang; Joe Lyons; Mautino; May; McCarthy; McGuire; Mendoza; Miller; Molaro; Nekritz; Osterman; Phelps; Reitz; Riley; Rita; Ryg; Scully; Smith; Soto; Verschoore; Washington; Yarbrough; Younge; and Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Meyer, we've called the roll on the Members voting 'yes'. Your..."
- Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Hernandez, I don't see she's in her chair."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hernandez, she's sitting next to Representative Lang. Raise your hand, Representative Hernandez."
- Meyer: "Is she lost? I know she's a freshman, but is she lost back there or what?"
- Speaker Lyons: "She's sitting next to Representative Lang. She's there."
- Meyer: "Oh, okay. Getting instructions? Representative Joyce."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kevin Joyce. Kevin Joyce is not here. We'll take Representative Joyce off... off the Roll Call. Wait a minute."

Meyer: "Oh, is he out there..."

Speaker Lyons: "He's walking in the chamber."

Meyer: "...having lunch or what?"

Speaker Lyons: "He's walking in the chamber, Representative Sacia (sic-Meyer)."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Meyer: "Eating popcorn in the back, I see. Okay.

 Representative Feigenholtz. Oh, I see, she just walked in the... Representative Davis."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Davis, he's behind you, Representative. He's on your Republican side."
- Meyer: "He's... he's becoming more intelligent as I get to know him, you know. Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hoffman did not... did not vote on the affirmative."
- Meyer: "Okay. Representative Howard. No, she's right there.
 Okay. Representative Patterson. He's not voting. Okay."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Patterson is absent, Representative."
- Meyer: "These bifocals are having a hard time seeing on the other side of the aisle."
- Speaker Lyons: "Further, Representative?"
- Meyer: "No, I'll withdraw that. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "All right. Again, this Bill, having received...

 House Bill 374, having received the Constitutional Majority
 by a vote of 62 'yea' and 50 'nay', is hereby declared
 passed. Representative Gordon, you have House Bill 1105.
 Representative, could you wait one second. Representative
 Black."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, is there a trial lawyer in the House? Is there a trial lawyer in the House? If they could... If a trial lawyer could go to the back, where the chair collapsed. This is a new chair, obviously, defective. Obviously, not built to Mr. Mapes' standards. I see... we have many witnesses. I think we should probably adjourn so

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

they could get all of the details and the appropriate lawsuit filed against the person who picked out these chairs, which unfortunately, would be Mr. Mapes, and the manufacturer and the shipper and the installer and anybody who has ever set in the chair. So, and I... all you need to take care of are the most important things. I mean, afterall what's more important than a potential lawsuit. Right?"

Speaker Lyons: "We are going to take your words under very serious consideration, Representative Black. Thanks for bringing that to our attention."

Black: "I'm sure you will. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "On the Order of Postponed Consideration, we have House Bill 1105. Representative Gordon."

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 1105 allows for a very narrow expansion of the Prevailing Wage Act dealing with workers that aggregate... who haul aggregate to worksites. We debated this in the past, all questions have been answered and I know that further explanations have been made to certain Members of the House. I would be happy to answer any further questions, but I would also be happiest with your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Mike Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Bost: "Originally, whenever we debated this Bill, Representative, I asked some specific questions. When we're talking about aggregate in... not the bulk form, but in the

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- bagged form that it's in, delivered to the lot to the job sites on pallets. Is that then going to require those people to be paid prevailing wage?"
- Gordon: "The Teamsters have said 'no' to that, Representative, the answer's 'no'."
- Bost: "Okay. The Teamsters have said 'no'. When did the Teamsters write... start writing language that's what amazes me. I've not quite figured out how it is that..."
- Gordon: "Well, Representative, the question was to clarify, what you said there were some questions last time and the people who I've gone to are the experts in this, the people who're going to deal with it. So, the answer's 'no'."
- Bost: "Okay. And I'm still saying that what language I could see here is not specific on bulk. If you look at the language and it obviously hasn't been changed since the last time we debated this, full text it says, 'but it includes but is not limited to rock, gravel, sand, pebbles, dirt, soil, clay, bitumen, cultured/polymer, cement, concrete, asphalt, slag, grinding.' Why would that not include bagged material? Why... why would that not include bagged material? I know you said the Teamsters say that that's not the case, but... but it's not the Teamsters that's going to rule on this if somebody files suit."
- Gordon: "Representative, my understanding is that that is not in the normal definition of aggregate material and so, the only thing I can tell you is the answer's 'no'."
- Bost: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, and I have to disagree with the Sponsor here, respect her tremendously. But aggregate material, you've all seen it, in bagged form, that is still

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

aggregate material. What we're saying is is that there... what we're... we're heading down a road here where every company out there that's driving down the road either they're going to have to pay prevailing wage even though they may not be from the state, they bring these to the job site or what's going to happen is your contractor is going to have to take these, unload them at a separate site, pick this product up, take it to the site and then pay prevailing wage, which means they're doubling the cost if not tripling or quadrupling the cost of doing these jobs. This is a poor precedent, it's wrong. And I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Winters: "Representative, has the language changed since the last time we voted on this?"

Gordon: "No, Sir."

Winters: "I didn't see any Amendments that would make it more clear where 'close proximity' is actually defined. People need to understand that this went through the Appellate Court, through the Supreme Court of Illinois and it continually aggregate material was not... they ruled that this is not appropriate for prevailing wage. This is an attempt to get around the court system. It's... the language is as indefinite as it was before. It will simply create additional court cases as we fight out year after year, case after case, driving up costs for business and costing jobs. It is going to simply make every public works project in

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Illinois a more expensive project. It will divert public monies that could be used to build more miles of highway. It will spend that money on labor costs and it won't get the projects done that we need done. So, as we did before, I urge that this Body turn down this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. You know, I'm a strong believer in the collective bargaining process. I've always thought it's just another way of being... of doing business and then reasonable people sit down at the table and they usually come up with a pretty good contract. a member of the IEA and on the bargaining committee many, many years ago, so I don't have problem with the collective bargaining process. But what I'm beginning to see here is that what... whatever can't be collectively bargained to give one party a significant advantage is now being brought to the General Assembly. Now, make no mistake about it, this legislation effectuates a significant expansion prevailing wage requirements. And as Representative Bost said, it also is ill-defined as to who exactly is covered under this. You know, the list of opponents is as long as my arm and the list of opponents includes the City of Chicago. And there's going to be a tremendous amount of construction in the City of Chicago, not only currently, but if they are fortunate enough to be the Olympic city for 2016, a tremendous amount of construction. The City of Chicago, I don't know why they're opposed, but they

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

certainly are. And let me just try to point out, and Representative Bost knows more about this than I do because of his background in the trucking business, the Illinois Road and Transportation Builders Association is adamantly opposed to the Bill. Their position was misstated a few weeks ago and they're simply pointing out that if you want to disenfranchise the Illinois Department of Transportation, disadvantage business enterprise and minority-business enterprise, then vote for this Bill. They probably won't get many contracts. Some of the questions posed by the Ready Mix Concrete business, I think, would explain to you why they've always been exempt from this under collective bargaining. For example, how does a company dispatching concrete trucks respect seniority when the type of job could be spread out through the day? How do we respect seniority to get the right man on the right job at the right time? Applying the prevailing wage when our truck will only be on the job site 30 minutes or an hour at most would increase that driver's wage and benefits sometimes up to thirty dollars (\$30) an hour over their normal wage and benefit. Now, is that wage applied from the time the driver gets in the truck or only the time the driver spends going from the batch plant to the construction site or as Representative Winters said, does that mean close proximity to the job site? Maybe they've dumped the concrete a quarter mile away and they use a slurry pump to pump the concrete to the actual job site. How many hours of prevailing wage would you bid when you're bidding on a contract because you don't know whether you're going to deliver thirty (30) loads,

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

fifty (50) loads or ten (10) loads. What about in my area of the state where my house sits ten (10) miles from the Indiana line, what about an Indiana contractor who sees a golden opportunity in this. He isn't... he or she isn't going to bid prevailing wage and when they get to the job site, they're going to say, 'I'm sorry but I'm not registered ... Yeah, I won the bid and I'm an Indiana contractor and I'm not going to follow this Illinois law and I don't think you can make me follow this Illinois law.' So, the Indiana contractor is going to have a built-in advantage of at least fifteen dollars (\$15) an hour. I don't think that's your intent. But you forget that about forty-four (44) counties sit on another state's border. You know, not quite half of the counties in Illinois sit within very close proximity of either Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, Wisconsin, Kentucky and you're building in a cost disadvantage to those Illinois contractors who are now going to have to compete against an out-of-state contract. These are some of the reasons why the concrete industry has always been exempt from the prevailing wage statute. They are delivering a product to the job site. They are not working on the job site. I don't know what's gone wrong in the collective bargaining process, but I always thought every time a contract comes up both parties try to get the best contract they can. only in recent times have labor unions and businesses decided, if they don't get their way in the collective bargaining agreement, we'll come to the General Assembly and we'll have it mandated into law and then we don't have to bargain it next time. It will now be in State Law. I think

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

there are dozens of laws of unintended consequences should you pass this... it's greatly expanded and ill-defined expansion of the prevailing wage law. Ladies and Gentlemen, let the collective bargaining process work. If we're going to become the business agent for every labor dispute in the State of Illinois, God help us. And in my home county of Vermilion, where we sit right up against the border of Indiana, God help my contractors and God help those who work on a prevailing... or a job site delivering products. Mr. Speaker, should this Bill get the requisite number of votes, I would request a verification and I would also request in advance that you tell people to sit in their own seats and that staff retire to the back of the chamber. It makes the process much quicker. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: Ladies and Gentlemen, there's been a request for verification on this Bill. Representative Gordon to close." Gordon: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is about fairness. While I appreciate the arguments of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, especially Leader Black, I do believe when he asked for a trial lawyer earlier, he possesses the qualities that I admire in many trial lawyers and with exception as a trial partner whenever possible because what he just threw out with the collective bargaining argument is known as a red herring. So, thank you very, very much, Representative Black, but this is not about collective bargaining; it's about fairness. about making sure that workers are paid the proper wage by the people that they contract with. This is about making sure that the workers who have projects with public... on

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

public work sites are paid a fair wage, that they can go home and take care of their family. That's what this is about, making sure that people can live day-to-day and meet those requirements that are put on every single one of us in this country. Also, we talked about the list of opponents being as long as Representative Black's arm. However, I believe that the list of proponents may be about as long as the Houston Rocket's Yao Ming's seven foot six inch tall arm because Ladies and Gentlemen, this is about taking care of the people who work very, very hard every single day. I would ask for your 'yes' vote. This is important for workers, this is important for their families and this is about fairness in this Body. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, again, there is a verification request from Representative Black, therefore, please punch your own button. The question is, 'Should House Bill 1105 pass?' All those in favor should signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kosel. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 64 Members voting 'yes', 48 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And Mr. Black has requested a verification. I would ask all staff to please remove to the rear of the chamber. I would ask all those Members who were voting in the affirmative to please be in their seats. Mr. Clerk, read the list of those Members voting 'yes'."

Clerk Bolin: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Arroyo; Beiser; Berrios; Boland; John Bradley; Rich Bradley;

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Brosnahan; Burke; Chapa LaVia; Collins; Colvin; Crespo; Currie; D'Amico; Monique Davis; Will Davis; Dugan; Dunkin; Feigenholtz; Flider; Flowers; Ford; Franks; Fritchey; Froehlich; Golar; Gordon; Graham; Granberg; Hamos; Hannig; Harris; Hernandez; Holbrook; Howard; Jakobsson; Jefferies; Jefferson; Joyce; Lang; Lyons; Mautino; McAuliffe; McCarthy; McGuire; Mendoza; Miller; Bill Mitchell; Nekritz; Osterman; Phelps; Reitz; Riley; Rita; Ryg; Saviano; Smith; Soto; Turner; Verschoore; Washington; Yarbrough; Younge; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Representative Froehlich."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Froehlich."

Black: "I don't see him over there on your side."

Speaker Lyons: "He's a little closer to you, Representative."

Black: "Oh, oh, he's down here."

Speaker Lyons: "He's right there."

Black: "Oh. All right. I didn't know he was a business agent.

Representative..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black, Representative Saviano would like to be verified, he's walking off the floor."

Black: "Where'd he go?"

Speaker Lyons: "Back to his office."

Black: "I didn't see him. Did you see him?"

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, we..."

Black: "I haven't seen him since Ground Hog Day. He saw his shadow and went home, I thought. Is he… I'll take your word for it. He was really here? Okay. All right."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Lyons: "Absolutely, Representative."

Black: "Okay. Representative Granberg."

Speaker Lyons: "Is Representative Granberg in the chamber?

Representative Granberg. Believe he's in... coming up the backstairs. Mr. Black, he's in the rear of the chamber."

Black: "That's why I asked if they'd just sit in their seat it makes it a lot easier. The Gentleman I refer to as the, with all due affection, 'the gray ghost', Molaro? Is he at the track or is he in the back of the chamber? Oh, I'm sorry. I..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Molaro's here."

Black: "Well, he's voting the right way. He's an outstanding Gentleman. Representative McCarthy."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative McCarthy is sitting in my chair, Representative."

Black: "I think he was... well, that's why we can't find him, you know. Representative Fritchey."

Speaker Lyons: "Is Representative Fritchey in the chamber?

Representatives... Representative John Fritchey, coming in the backdoor, here he is. He was at the... out in the lobby.

Representative Fritchey's here. Representative...

Representative Black, anything further?"

Black: "I congratulate you on keeping your Members. When I came down here a few years ago... Of course, that's what happened when Sam's closed. I could always count on three (3) or four (4) Democrats and I don't mean to take their name in vain because they were dear friends. The late Monroe Flynn and Bruce Richmond, we could always count on them being gone

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

by 5:00, but that's what happened when Sam's closed, doggone it. So, I congratulate you on having your Members here."

Speaker Lyons: "It's not easy, but thank you, Mr. Black. House Bill 1105, having received 64 'yes' votes, 48 'no' and 1 'present', is hereby declared passed. Representative Ford, you have House Bill 1685. Representative Acevedo, you have a... seek recognition?"

Acevedo: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Acevedo."

Acevedo: "...on the previous Bill I was recorded as a 'present',
I'd like to change it to 'yes', please."

Speaker Lyons: "The record will so reflect. Representative Ford on House Bill 1685. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1685, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1685... I ask for your consideration... it expands the high school election judge program to include junior high school students in good standing. Under the current law, an election authority may only appoint high school seniors in good standing to serve as election judges. To serve as the election judge, the student must have at least a 3.0 to a 4.0 grade point average, obtain permission from the parent or legal guardian and obtain permission from the school principal. Additionally, high school students are more technically inclined and savvy, which would benefit all voters using the new electronic equipment. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Will, Representative Renee Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Kosel: "You just said that this Bill expands the students that can be used to junior high students or high school junior students?"

Ford: "High school junior students."

Kosel: "That isn't what you said when... in your opening remarks.

And I want to make it very clear that the legislative intent is not to take this to junior high students..."

Ford: "That's right. Thank you."

Kosel: "...but to third-year high school students."

Ford: "That's right."

Kosel: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Jim Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Meyer: "Representative, what is the age limit for a junior in high school to be... to act as a judge?"

Ford: "At this time there's no age limit."

Meyer: "So, in other words, my 17-year-old grandson who's not eligible to vote could, in fact, act as a judge over those who are eligible to vote because of their age and he would be mature enough probably to make certain that he conducts himself in the manner and understands election law the way the judges are supposed to understand it. Is that correct?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Ford: "I know that your 17-year-old... did you say your grandson is 17 years old?"

Meyer: "I did."

Ford: "Okay. Yes, I encourage him to be..."

Meyer: "A fine gentleman; he meets your criteria, too."

Ford: "That's good. I encourage him to participate in the process and I think he may be very well inclined to deal with the equipment that's used today almost better than some people..."

Meyer: "Why... why... Representative, why wouldn't you think that the person that's acting as a judge to determine if it's a fair election or not, would at least be eligible to vote?"

Ford: "I don't think they're going to determine whether or not it's a fair election. I think..."

Meyer: "Well, I don't know. Judges in my precinct they... they have responsibility to... to respond to challenges that people might make..."

Ford: "Respond. Yes."

Meyer: "...as they come in and might make a challenge to what's going on in the polling place. They are expected to keep order in the polling place. They're expected to officiate and control all the election materials. They're expected to make certain it's a fair election. That's the responsibilities of the judges in my precinct, so they differ in yours or what?"

Ford: "No. But I didn't say that I want them to be there, put people in charge. I think that it's a great opportunity for the students to have elders there as well to teach them

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

about the process and... and that's what this does also. They're not going to be totally responsible."

Meyer: "Is there any class that they're required to take to become a member of a judge... the member is a judge... excuse me... to become a judge in a polling place?"

Ford: "Yes. There is election judge training that the county requires."

"Well, Representative, to the Bill. All right. Meyer: understand that it's nice to involve our youth in elections; it's nice to involve our youth in the power... in the political atmosphere that we conduct business in this country. We have the best country in this world. break into it to get here. All those are great things, but Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it just is amazing to me that we would think that we should bring on election judges who are in no way are qualified to be voters because of their age and yet they would come onboard as an election judge and would actually be in charge of a polling place to the extent that judges are, that they would be given that responsibility to make sure it's a fair... fair ballot that's being cast in that polling place, they would be able to respond to challenges that are made within that polling place and be expected to give mature types of opinions as to whether it's a proper challenge or not. I... I believe we're opening up Pandora's Box to elections that would become unmanaged and uncontrolled from the stand place of what goes on in a polling place. And I would strongly... stand in strong opposition to this Bill."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this one's on Short Debate. We'll put it on Standard Debate. There are eight (8) people seeking recognition. We've had two people speak in response: Representative Kosel, Representative Meyer. Representative Ford has spoken in favor of his Bill. The next speaker is Representative Moffitt. Are you in favor of the Bill or are you speaking in response, Representative? Representative Froehlich, are you in... speaking in response to the Bill or in favor of the Bill? In favor, proceed, Representative."

Froehlich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, we currently allow high school seniors who can be as young as sixteen (16) to be election judges. They aren't, obviously, not registered to vote. So, that question came up, that's under current law. Here's our problem. There's a shortage, at least in Cook County, of sufficient people willing to be So, that's why we brought in the first judge program in the first place. And I think it's a great... as a former high school social studies teacher, I think it's a great day of civic education to get high school kids into the polling place to see how the process works. And... so, I stand in support of this Bill both because it's needed, we don't have enough judges, at least in Cook County, even paying a hundred and fifty (150) bucks on the day. I have a responsibility to find enough judges and because we currently allow judges as young as sixteen (16) and because of the educational benefits, the civic education for any young people who participate. Thank you."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Lyons: "Again, Ladies and Gentlemen, we've had two people speak in favor of the Bill, two (2) spegal... two (2) people speak in response. There are still six (6) speakers: Representative Bassi, Dugan, Nekritz, Black, Fritchey, and Sullivan. So, Representative Bassi, you're next. Do you wish to speak in favor of the Bill or in opposition?"

Bassi: "In favor."

Speaker Lyons: "You'll be the last speaker in favor of the Bill."

Bassi: "Yeah."

Speaker Lyons: "Proceed, Representative."

Bassi: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Bassi: "Okay. All right. I would stand in strong support of this Bill. I think this is an excellent idea. It goes along with some of the things that Representative Davis and I have been trying to do to encourage young people to be involved in the political process. I think this is one of the best ways for young people to learn how important it is for them to show up to vote and even if they're not old enough to vote, this gives them some introduction into the process. And I would stand in strong support."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Members, for your cooperation on this. Representative Ford to close."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank all the people… all the honorable people that spoke in favor of the Bill. I think that the juniors that were here today showed behavior that proved that they could serve as judges and hopefully,

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- we didn't influence them today with our behavior. And I ask for a favorable vote for House Bill 1685. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 1685 pass?'
 All those in favor should signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bradley, Davis. Monique. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 105 Members voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Saviano, you have... Representative Monique Davis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Davis, M.: "There was a horrible mistake on my machine. I meant to hit the green button and I'm a cosponsor on this Bill and accidentally hit the red. I wish to be recorded as voting 'yes'. I wish to be recorded as voting 'aye' on this Bill that is the Bill of my seatmate and this was his first Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, the Journal will so reflect.

 Representative Saviano, you have House Bill 1281. Mr.

 Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1281, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Saviano."
- Saviano: "House Bill 1281 is simply a cleanup Bill for the Department of Professional Regu... Financial and Professional Regulation. It corrects a drafting error in the original

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Bill that we passed last year. And I would ask for its adoption. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking recognition on House Bill 1281, the question is, 'Should it pass?' All those in favor should signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Acevedo. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 111 Members voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Postponed Consideration, Representative Graham has House Bill 318. The Lady from Cook, Representative Graham."

Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have before you again House Bill 318, which allows the utility companies to continue to report to your credit how well you're paying your credit... how well you're paying your utility bills, but it won't be used as a determinant to your score. I'll try to answer any questions at this time."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "...Bill."

Sullivan: "We debated this before and we talked about why and for what reason you would want credit being given... to be used in credit scores... utility bills to be used in credit scores. They do this to assess risk. If you cannot tell or know that a person is a risk to give them more credit, they're going to get themselves into more trouble. I

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

understand what the Representative is trying to do. She's trying to help people out, but the reverse is going to happen, because if someone cannot their credit... or their utilities and then we cannot know this through their credit score, what is going to happen is they're going to get more credit and get more into debt and the cycle will be vicious and vicious and vicious. This is not good legislation. I understand what she's trying to do, it's an honorable attempt to try and help some people out. But Ladies and Gentlemen, we need to know people that are bad credit risks 'cause ultimately this will cost everybody else more money down the line. So, I, you know, I request a 'no' vote here."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. I don't know that I can add much to what Representative Sullivan has, in fact, already said. From my previous remarks, there are no proponents listed on this Bill and there are a number of opponents. And I think, following up on what Representative Sullivan said, your credit... this may sound somewhat meanspirited and I don't mean it that way, but your credit score is not something that you have an inalienable right to. It's something you build up over the years and protect it as carefully as you can. And I have always found that if you talk to the various people who extend credit, if you've had a difficulty in your life, if you've had a period of unemployment, a period of illness, that these people

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

generally will work with you to establish a reasonable payment plan, which then does not show up as an extreme negative on your credit score. And I was taught that by the labor representative of Vermilion County United Way. When we're experiencing so many plant closures in the early '90s, we ran several classes that said that if you will reach out to your creditors and explain to them that you are one of the layoffs from General Motors or Hyster or one of the other companies that they'll do their best to... to work with But to deny without written consent access to your utility bill and you know, if we were really worried that brings up the whole issue. If you're really concerned about the people struggling, as they are, to pay their utility bills, could you tell me why we haven't acted on a utility rate freeze or a phase-in or some kind of relief from the utility bills that have been in effect since January 1 and this is April 19? What's going on here? I have filed a half a dozen Bills. Representative Bradley has filed Bills. That is I... people all over the chamber have filed various Bills, none of which have been heard none of which have been called. So, if you're worried about the increased impact of utility bills, I think it's disingenuous of us to say, 'well, we're concerned about this, but we haven't done anything since January 1', but back to the issue at hand. Your credit score is carefully earned over a period of time. And if you will do everything in your power to protect that credit rating, including reaching out to the utility company or a credit card company or a charge account in a local store, you can generally maintain your credit rating while

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

making some minimum payments to the company, but if you don't do anything and you don't say anything and you don't reach out to them, all they're going to think is, well, you didn't pay. They don't know the circumstances. It is the best advice I ever heard and it was from the labor rep to our... our county United Way and we were working with people suffering through extensive layoffs. So, I... I don't know what could be gained by not letting your utility bill be available to various credit bureaus trying to keep your credit rating as accurate as possible. If you open this door, then what's next, your gasoline credit card? Gasoline, I looked at the gas buddy today and the high gasoline price in Chicago is already \$3.32 a gallon. So, in another month or two we're going to start having tremendous pressure on people who buy gasoline to get to work or to take their children to school or take their children to after-school events. What's next? You... you don't have access to their gasoline credit card? Credit is not an inalienable right. And I know lots of people who don't have any credit. They either pay cash or they do without. Not me, but I do have some in my district who simply don't have any charge accounts whatsoever and they don't want any. This is however well-intentioned to protect people it comes back hurting a whole bunch of people because we then have to pick up..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, if you could bring your remarks to a close. Give you one... another minute."

Black: "Certainly, certainly, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

We all end up paying higher interest rates when credit is

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

abused and bankruptcies go up and all of that that I... you know... you know as well as I do. Mr. Speaker, once again, and I'm hoping we can do this very quickly if we need to, but should this Bill get the requisite number of votes, I would request a verification."

Speaker Lyons: "So noted, Representative. Verification will be enforced. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is on Standard Debate. We've had two people speak in response to the Bill. The Sponsor has spoken in favor of the Bill. We'll take one more person in response, two more people in favor. The next person is Representative Mulligan. Representative Mulligan, are you in response to the Bill or in support?"

Mulligan: "I'm in support."

Speaker Lyons: "Proceed, Representative."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates she will."

Mulligan: "Representative Graham, what's left in this Bill after you amended it only that... that the information from the utility companies cannot be used in credit scores. Is that correct?"

Graham: "That's correct."

Mulligan: "But they still can collect it."

Graham: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Which I wouldn't put you through a (Inaudible) any longer. If they collect it do the utility companies gain anything from the ability to give them your information? Do they get any money for it? Does anything happen?"

Graham: "What they... they would still benefit because the world would know that they have not paid their utility bills.

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

They still benefit because they want people to know that this person hasn't paid their utility bills, so that hasn't stopped."

Mulligan: "So, it's a threat?"

Graham: "Yes. It's a threat."

Mulligan: "Okay. Let's talk about credit. Late night TV now has a program that you can do where you can make money on people who default on their mortgages. Mortgages that were lent at rates that no longer are viable. We're preying on people. NICOR has a subsidiary called NICOR Solutions where if you go on with your Northern Illinois Gas bill on your regular bill and say you want it on a monthly payment plan, you can receive that. But if you do NICOR Solutions, which is a subsidiary of NICOR, and you put yourself on a payment plan and it turns out you're paying too much, you have to pay a penalty to get off of it. They don't tell you that. The predatory lending Bills that have come through... all the different things in JCAR are totally unbelievable what they're doing with people and credit. The fact that I have senior citizens, one who's an accountant in my area who gets an estimated bill from their utility company that is totally wrong and totally over and then has a late payment because he refuses to pay it and then goes back and tries to negotiate and cannot negotiate and doesn't pay his bill now has a poor credit score. There is something wrong with what we're doing with credit in this country and there's something wrong with what we're doing in credit in Illinois. And I have to tell you, although I would certainly support some issues on credit, this is not one of them. I think we

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

need to take a good hard look at what's happening. And if the utility companies are not only going to change the rates that they're charging, but they're not going to mess around with people and how they can pay long payment plans, charge them extra money and then go after people who tend to challenge an estimated bill that's totally wrong, it's time and particularly for people to stand up Legislature, if we're here to protect people in general whether they're poor, wealthy or whatever that want to take a stand on credit and credit issues then I think we need to start supporting something like this. I told the Lady I would support her Bill the last time, I looked at the issue and I thought about it. But some of the things you see that are going on with credit in Illinois and around the country with credit companies, with mortgage companies, with different things, we need to make a statement about something. So, at some point we stand up and we say, what's going on here isn't fair whether you're poor, medium income or wealthy. Something is wrong here and we need to have a better examination. We just don't kowtow to people that want to charge you something. If a credit company changes the date that your bill is due and then decides to change your interest rate 'cause you weren't on time, something is wrong with that. If you foreclose on a mortgage 'cause the mortgage company that sold you a mortgage will not amend it now that the interest rates have gone up, something is probably wrong with that. If they're selling programs on television of how to make money because you forfeited on your mortgage, there's something wrong with that.

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

people can't afford to pay their bills or want to challenge a bill and not pay for it and then it goes against their credit score, there's something wrong with that. So, I commend the Lady for at least speaking out. I don't think the Members on our side or other Members that are looking at, they're looking at credit from an old-fashioned They're not looking at credit now that is standpoint. predatory. If you go at a casino, a check-cashing person they will give... they will cash your check for three hundred dollars (\$300) because they can get penalties up to three times. They won't cash your check for five hundred dollars (\$500) because then it's fraud. There's something wrong with that. There is something wrong with credit in Illinois and there's something wrong with credit around this country and I think we need to take a good, hard look at it. Credit is not as it's been portrayed; it's not the old-fashioned thing of how you pay your bills and what happens. It's a big business and it's a business where people collect on you and take advantage of poor people and I think we need to take a hard look of what's happening here in Illinois."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we've had two people speak in response, two people in favor. We'll take one more speaker on each side of the issue. Representative Jefferson, do you seek recognition in response to the Bill or in support?"

Jefferson: "In support."

Speaker Lyons: "Proceed, Representative Jefferson."

Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Jefferson: "First of all, I rise in support of this Bill. I think it's a good Bill. I think that I concur with the Representative that just spoke previous to me. We shouldn't penalize people who sometimes aren't in a position to pay their bills, because you might miss one payment it doesn't mean that your credit should be bad or be penalized. I think at one point, if I could ask of Representative Graham, at one point were the utility companies opposed to this legislation?"

Graham: "I'm sorry. I was..."

Jefferson: "At one point were the utility companies opposed to this legislation?"

Graham: "Yes."

Jefferson: "And now they take no position, right?"

Graham: "ComEd and Ameren took no position on the Bill."

Jefferson: "Okay."

Graham: "And they... and they seem to be listed on the analysis as no position, but I'm not sure what they're saying otherwise to the utility companies."

Jefferson: "Okay. I think this is a good Bill. I think it's a good Bill simply because people are in a position sometimes where they can't pay their utility bills. Sometimes people need assistance with their utility bills. Should they be penalized because they can't pay their utility bills? I think not. It's hard enough sometimes that we can't buy things because we got credit... we don't have good credit because of situations like this. This needs to be eliminated as far as your credit score goes and let people stand on their own merits. I applaud the, Representative

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

for this Bill because I know it's a good Bill. I deal with this every day in my district and it's just going to alleviate some of the problems that the people would ordinarily have if, in fact, you didn't present this Bill. So, I stand in support and I hope that everyone in the General Assembly will support this legislation. It's good legislation. Thank you."

- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we've had three people speak in support of the Bill. Is anybody seeking recognition to... in response to the Bill? Represen... Representative, are you speaking in response to the Bill?"
- Molaro: "Well, yeah, if there's nobody else left in response.

 Is there anybody else left in response that wishes to speak?"
- Speaker Lyons: "We have you and Representative Dugan. We've had three people speak in favor of the Bill. We have room for one person to speak in response."

Molaro: "Good."

Speaker Lyons: "I've had Standard Debate enforced on this Bill."

Molaro: "All right. Well, I'll be in response then. I don't want to take anybody's spot, but I'm... I'm going to... I'm going to question her and right now I'm not for the Bill, but I don't know what she's going to say when I ask her questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Ask a question."

Molaro: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When did... when did we have it where they actually started reported them to the credit bureau because it was never... it never was always like that, right. When did that start?"

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Graham: "That's correct. I under... my understanding from the gas companies, they started with the gas companies back in 1997 and then in 2003 or 2004 my colleague, who is no longer with us, put the legislation in."

Molaro: "Okay. So... I don't mean to cut you off, but they're going to cut..."

Graham: "Sure."

Molaro: "...me off so... so let me do this. So... so, therefore, they just started reporting 'em maybe four (4) or five (5) years ago."

Graham: "Yes."

Molaro: "So, these... these Experian and Trans Union and all them, been around thirty (30), forty (40), fifty (50) years..."

Graham: "Yes."

Molaro: "...in some how they'll be giving credit histories..."

Graham: "Yes."

Molaro: "...all those years without knowing what's going on with utility companies."

Graham: "Mmm mmm, yes."

Molaro: "Now, let me ask you this question. Don't... Wouldn't it be a fair statement to say that when you talk about credit like a credit card or a bank somebody gives you money and then you have to pay back the money?"

Graham: "Yes."

Molaro: "Okay. And you have a credit history, that's what credit is, right?"

Graham: "Yes."

Molaro: "You have a credit history that says here's the kind of money she borrowed, say it's you..."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Graham: "Yes."

Molaro: "...and here's how her payment schedule was, her payment history. And if you borrowed money and you didn't pay it back, then you'd be a bad credit risk."

Graham: "That's correct."

Molaro: "And if you paid it... you paid... you borrowed money, credit card, bank, mortgage, loan company and you didn't pay it back in thirty (30) or sixty (60) or ninety (90) days, that would be in your credit history."

Graham: "That's correct."

Molaro: "Now, when you're bor... when you go out and you get your electric bill, you're not borrowing money are you?"

Graham: "No."

Molaro: "So, it's not credit; you're not borrowing any money."

Graham: "Mmm mmm."

Molaro: "Well, you know what, I stood in response, but you've convinced me now that this is not... credit is borrowing money. You convinced me it's just not about borrowing money. It really shouldn't be in your credit history. Now, it could be in something on how you pay your utility bills, maybe we should have something different for that. But in your credit history, when you are saying if you're borrowing money it should be in there how you pay back that money and you don't want that changed."

Graham: "No, I don't want that changed."

Molaro: "But you're not borrowing money when you pay your utility bill, so why should it be here. You convinced me. I'm going to vote 'yes' on your Bill."

Graham: "Thank you."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Graham to close."

Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Again, I brought this legislation forward to help constituents. Again, when you walk in and you pick up... apply for a car loan, a mortgage, or any of those things, you know what the payment is going to be before you leave there. With the recent rate increases and the announcement from Peoples' Energy with them seeking a rate increase, people could get bills up into... upwards of four and five and seven hundred dollars (\$400 and \$500 and \$700), which are another car note or mortgage, and you're expected to pay that money in its entirety. The... they do, in fact, have plans to work with you, buy if you deviate from that plan even one inch, you're kicked off of it, you can't get back on it for another six (6) months or even up to a year. So, yes, they have programs out there but once you're trying to kick... catch up with the back payment and paying forward on the current payment, the ... even the fixed payment may be too much for you. So, again, my intentions here were to... is to help our constituents and not cause a friction that this piece of legend hit... legislation has caused. I, again, urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there's been a request for verification, so once again Representative Black will be verifying the 'aye' votes. The question is, 'Should House Bill 318 pass?' Vote your own switch. All those in favor should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr.

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Clerk... Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 59 Members voting 'yes', 52 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared failed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 611?"

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 611 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "On the request of the Sponsor, move that Bill back to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 736?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 736 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "On the request of the Sponsor, move that Bill back to Second Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to be turning to page 37 of the Calendar, on the Order of Resolutions. We'll start in the middle of the page, page 37. Mr. Clerk, you have House Joint Resolution Amendment 1. Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "The Chair recognizes Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In the 94th General Assembly, we passed unanimously House Joint Resolution 43 and this Resolution, House Joint Resolution 1, simply extends the… the Resolution so that the… the task force has time to complete its work. It's a bipartisan effort. Representative Nekritz and myself have been very active with the task force on the deaf and hard of hearing education options and we'd like to continue on with this. Everyone that is a participant in this has agreed that the work needs to continue."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Speaker Lyons: "Anybody seeking any recognition on House Joint Resolution 1? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 1 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Colvin. Mr. Clerk, take the On this Resolution, there's 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Joint Resolution #2, House Mr. Representative Granberg. Is Representative Granberg in the Out of the record. House Joint Resolution #4, Representative Reis. Representative Reis... Reis in the Mr. Clerk, take that Bill out... take that Resolution out of the record. House Joint Resolution... House Joint Resolution #5. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Flowers on House Joint Resolution 5. Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I urge the passage of House Resolution 5. There's a serious problem in the State of Illinois in re... in regards to hospital infection and this is just urging the cleanup. And I would appreciate the passage of House Resolution 5."
- Speaker Lyons: "Nobody seeking recognition in response to House Resolution #5? Representative Ryg. Representative Kathy Ryg."
- Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege, just for an announcement to remind all the Members that the COWL organizing meeting for our... this year's Capitol Capers

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

will be held immediately following Session in Room 118. All Members are invited to come and participate at whatever level they are comfortable, but again, bring your talents and thoughts because this is the opportunity for us to put on another great show. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, the question was on House Joint Resolution 5. Anybody seeking recognition? Seeing not, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 5 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Joint Resolution #5 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, on page 37 of the Calendar we have House Joint Resolution #7... #11. House Joint Resolution #11, Representative Connie Howard. Representative, out of the record? Take that Resolution out of the record, Mr. Clerk. On page 38 of the Calendar, under Joint Resolutions, Representative Yarbrough has House Joint Resolution #14. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Karen Yarbrough on House Joint Resolution 14."

Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Resolution simply allows the Slave Commission to report by 2008, December 31, 2008. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking recognition regarding House Joint Resolution #14, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 14 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

the record. On this Resolution, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill... this Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 38 of the Calendar, Representative Washington has House Joint Resolution #17. Representative Washington. Representative, I believe we have an Amendment on House Joint Resolution 17."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, I want to adopt #2. House Bill Amendment #2."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, I think you have to withdraw Resolution... Amendment #1 should be withdrawn. Is that your Motion?"

Washington: "Yes."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. Amendment #1 is withdrawn. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Now, we wish to adopt Amendment #2 to House Joint Resolution 17."

Washington: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lyons: "The Motion is to adopt House Amendment #2 to House Joint Resolution #7... on House Joint Resolution 17. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the adoption... the Amendment is adopted. Representative, on the... on the Resolution."

Washington: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is something I attempted to do a couple years ago and I really just messed it all up. And I just think that the State of Illinois is much better off in having

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

residents such as the one that we are honoring here today and that's Miss Oprah Winfrey and I... and I can't say enough about her. I mean, the critics can criticize all they want, but her goodness will outlast time. And I just think for someone who does so much unselfishly and doesn't have to do it, not only is she a good ambassador in Africa and other places, when you just count the number of things and the educational information of her program and her magazine, the list goes on and on and on. I just think she's such an awesome human being and should be highly favored and highly recognized. And I ask this Body in joining me in sharing that every year the... in the month of February, during Black History Month, not only should the first but the last week in February should be recognized as Oprah Winfrey Week throughout the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ken Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for this Joint Resolution?"

Speaker Lyons: "He indicates he will."

Dunkin: "You know, he's absolutely correct, Oprah Winfrey has played such an incredible role here, not only in this state but in this country. She has done a tremendous job in terms of donating money to causes that really a lot of us down here feel so... feel very strongly about: homelessness, schools, scholarships, housing, so this is great. I think this is exactly what we should do. We should give people their flowers while they're livin'. So, thank you, Representative Washington, for this Joint Resolution and I'd

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

be happy to be a host or excuse me, a cosponsor for this House Joint Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 17 as amended be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Joint Resolution 17 is adopted. Page 38, we have House Joint Resolution #19. The Chair recognizes Representative Barbara Flynn Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This Resolution would cause the... the part of the Illinois Tollway System from the State of Illinois between the intersection of Interstate 294 and the state line with... with Wisconsin would designate it as the Jane Addams Memorial Tollway. As you know, Jane Addams was an early important Illinois woman born in Cedarville. She went to the Rockford College for Women. She was the founder of the Settlement House movement and she was the major figure in helping to lift women and their children out of poverty. She was the first woman to win the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1931. I'd appreciate your support for designating this Tollway... this portion of the Tollway in her honor."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, I was just up that way about two or three weeks ago and I... I kept seeing all these signs. I

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

thought we'd renamed this the Rod Blagojevich Tollway. Was I mistaken 'cause I saw these signs every once in a while."

Currie: "I think you were mistaken."

Black: "Oh."

Currie: "I don't think we've named it that yet."

Black: "Well, then I think that..."

Currie: "We may still, but we haven't yet."

Black: "I think this is an excellent idea. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from... from Cook, Representative Riley. Representative Riley."

Riley: "Will the Sponsor please yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates she will."

Riley: "Representative... Representative Currie, I think this is a great Bill. I also just want to mention, of course, that she is the namesake of one of the... the greatest schools of social work in the country, Jane Addams School of Social Work at UIC, which I sit on a couple of boards at UIC. So, it's a tremendous idea and hopefully the road will be clear on 294 to honor the work that she's done. So, I'm in support of your Resolution."

Currie: "Thank you for those comments."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake,
Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates she will."

Osmond: "Is this going through Lake County?"

Currie: "It's going from the intersection of 294 to the state line and I'm not... I think... I thought that was the county

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

that includes Rockford rather than Lake County. Maybe Representative Wait can help us with the geography."

Osmond: "No, that's... I just needed that clarified 'cause they said it was Lake County and I wasn't sure that that was true."

Currie: "I think it's Winnebago."

Osmond: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Currie: "Representative Wait is nodding in the affirmative."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 19 be... House Joint Resolution #19 be adopted?' All those in favor should signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Ryg. Representative Leitch. David. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Resolution, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. Mr. Clerk, on page 38 of the Calendar we have House Joint Resolution #21. Representative Art Turner. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, on page 38 of the Calendar we have House Joint Resolution #22. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This task force came to me as a result of a tragic accident in Champaign County and the state's attorney said that the Vehicle Code... and I think Representative Franks or somebody said this the other day... the Vehicle Code is behind the curve of technology and she thinks that we should have this task force to study what

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

constitutes distracted driving and the Vehicle Code could then, if the Body agrees later on, could put that in the Vehicle Code so that officers would know how to respond and state's attorneys would have something to argue in a court of law. That's all the Resolution does."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Davis, W.: "Representative, in the… in the Calendar it says that this report should be… it shall be reported to the General Assembly no later than July 1 of this year? Is that enough time to study what you're talkin' about?"

Black: "I think it's been amended to July of 2008."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Black: "That's what staff tells me."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Black: "That I'll agree with you. That wouldn't be enough time."

Davis, W.: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bob Molaro."

Molaro: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Molaro: "I know this is the response to what happened, Bill, when we talked about..."

Black: "Correct."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Molaro: "...that other Bill. So, but with it I got to say maybe we should put it back to July 1... I got to tell ya why... of this year. It's going to take us that long to know what distracted driving is. We almost kinda know it. You know, I mean..."

Black: "Yeah."

Molaro: "...and wait I'm not saying the task force because we have to go through it, there's no doubt about it, we always got to do these kind of dances here. But I think we should come back with something as soon as we can because it's a problem and I'd like a law to stop me from driving distracted. No, I'm not kidding. I mean, I'm not saying it to be funny. I do things I shouldn't do all the time; it took a law for me to put on a seatbelt, to put my kids in the backseat. mean, it's a shame that we have to do it. I just hope we get it as quickly as possible 'cause we really need it 'cause accidents... one of the worst accidents used to be, you know, road debris. You know, trying to hit it in your car. Now, it is definitely coffee, eating... I mean, it's really is becoming a mess. So, I mean, it gets to the point almost where I think people think they... because they're in the safety of the car and sometimes seatbelts almost make ya think you're even safer, that you're really not out on the road doing seventy-five (75) miles an hour. That you're actually in some video game, let's eat, let's drink, let's talk. And so, I think ya should get to this as quick as you can 'cause it is... this is a heck of a safety factor. Thank you."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking further recognition, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution #22 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mautino, to be recorded? Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this, there are 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared adopted. Page 38 of the Calendar is House Joint Resolution #23. Representative Mike Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution 23 proclaims March 4 through the 10 of 2007 and every first full week in March each year thereafter as Local Government Week in the State of Illinois. Simply gives local government the opportunity to have a time during March where they might educate their citizens in the function of their government and new programs that they have and quite frankly, I was surprised we never had a Local Government Week. So, I was glad to be a Sponsor of this Bill and think this will serve our citizens well."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 23 pass?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Joint Resolution 23 is adopted. On the bottom of page 38 is House Joint Resolution #25. Representative David Winters. Representative Winters, you have House Joint Resolution 25."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution urges Congress and the President to enact nationwide legislation to acquire that we add bittering agents to antifreeze so that it would check... protect children and animals from poisoning or death from ingesting antifreeze. I'd urge its adoption."
- Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 25 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Joint Resolution 25 is adopted. On the top of page 39, Representative Will Davis, you have House Joint Resolution #26. Representative Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 26 simply urges the Illinois Delegation of the United States Con... United States Congress to ensure the timely reauthorization of the States Children's Health Insurance Program, affectionately known as SCHIP, to ensure federal funding for the All Kids program."
- Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 26 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Joint Resolution 26 is hereby adopted. Page 39 of the Calendar is House Joint Resolution 27. Representative Karen Yarbrough."
- Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I have for your consideration today Joint Resolution... House Joint Resolution 27, which calls on the Congress of the

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

United States to reconsider and repeal the Real ID Act of In 2005 Congress acted, without meaningful hearings and debates to adopt the Real ID Act. This measure requires the Secretary of State's Office to digitize and store all documents submitted in support of a driver's license or Moreover, Congress has not provided the state ID card. necessary funds to implement this law. The measure is an unfunded mandate creating a bureaucratic nightmare for Illinois drivers and residents while threatening the privacy and information securing millions of mil... millions of Americans. If the Real ID Act becomes law, the people of Illinois will simply have to act on faith and hope that every other state or territory provides the same protections. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 27 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Joint Resolution 27 is hereby adopted. Page 39 of the Calendar, Representative Stephens has House Joint Resolution #28. Representative Ron Stephens. Out of the record. Page 39 of the Calendar, House Joint Resolution 30. Representative Michael Smith. Representative Mike Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Resolution would designate... excuse me... the last Sunday in September and then the week following that as Gold Star Families Week and would encourage everyone in the state to display the flag in reverence for the Gold Star families and of course, Gold Star families are those families who... who

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

have had members pay the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our country. So, I would ask for your approval of this Resolution."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 30 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mitchell. Osterman. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. House Joint Resolution 30 is Representative Hernandez, you have House Joint Resolution 31. Representative Hernan... House Resolution 31. Representative Hernandez. Out of the record, Representative? Out of the record. Page 39... Representative Miller has House Joint Resolution #32. Representative David Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ladies... Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution 31 (sic-32) asks the Illinois Student Assistance Commission, in cooperation with other concerned parties, to assess the needs for independent students in terms of the Monetary Assistance Programs. That report is to be given to us in the General Assembly by December 31. I ask for a favorable consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing as no one's seeking recognition, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 32 be adopted?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Resolution, there are 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Joint Resolution 32 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, we'll go back to page 38 of the Calendar, Representative Turner, House Joint Resolution 21. Representative Art Turner."

- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I apologize that we had to take it out of the record a minute ago, but this is a Resolution that deals with changing the reporting date for the long-term prisoner study committee. The report initially was due July 1, we're moving it to a December 1, 2007. And I move for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 21."
- Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no one's speaking... seeking recognition, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 21 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Jakobsson. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Resolution, there's 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This... and Resolution... House Resolution 21... House Joint Resolution 21 is adopted. Page 38... 39 of the Calendar, Representative Monique Davis has House Resolution 11. Representative Davis, Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 11 urges the United States Congress to require the United States

 Department of Agriculture to conduct a study and report on

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

the nutritional value of the country's school lunches, elementary and secondary education."

Speaker Lyons: "No seeking recognition, the question is, 'Should House Resolution 11 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 11 is adopted. Page 40 of the Calendar, Representative Fritchey has House Resolution 25. Representative Fritchey in the chamber? Out of the record. House Resolution 46, Representative Chapa LaVia. Page 40 of the Calendar, Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. You know, there... there is all we... we always talk about the heroes, the veterans, the servicemen and women that are active Army, the individuals that are our law enforcement and fire department, but we don't often think of our postal workers as doing that job. Yeah, I know. So, I would recommend a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, are you going to mail this Resolution to everyone in the City of Chicago?"

Chapa LaVia: "I thought I'd e-mail it."

Black: "That's better. Thank you. They do a good job, but I noticed that they are having some difficulties in Chicago."

Speaker Lyons: "All those in favor of the adoption of House Resolution 46 indicate by saying 'yes'; those opposed say

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. House Resolution 46 is adopted. Representative Beth Coulson, you have House Resolution 47. The Chair recognizes Representative Beth Coulson."
- Coulson: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 47 encourages the State of Illinois to take steps to secure funds from the recently passed federal Comprehensive Lifespan Respite Care Act of 2006 when those funds become available. The Federal Government... program authorizes two hundred and eighty-nine million (\$289,000,000) over five (5) years in competitive state grants. And this Resolution encourages us to develop and implement respite care programs for the State of Illinois. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "And the question is, 'Should House Resolution 47 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 47 is adopted. Representative Chapa LaVia, you have House Resolution 50."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. This Resolution urges the United States Congress and President to make each federal election day a national holiday. What better way to get the constituency more involved in... in the process of this representative democracy. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Resolution 50 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 50 is hereby passed. House

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Resolution 54, Representative Jack Franks. House Resolution 54."

- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's past the fact, but we had filed it before. This is a Resolution that would declare February 14 as a tribute to Kathy Posner. She was a 'Heart of Gold' Award recipient for Shaare Zedek Medical Center out of Jerusalem. It raised a lot of money for that. Had a wonderful lunch on Valentine's Day and raised hundred of thousands of dollars for the hospital that treats both Palestinians and Israelis for trauma and it's a wonderful organization."
- Speaker Lyons: "All those in favor of the adoption of House Resolution 54 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. House Resolution 54 is adopted. Representative Franks, don't sit down, you have House Resolution 55, Representative Jack Franks."
- Franks: "Hou... Lou Lang joins me in asking that you support House Resolution 55, which proclaims February 6 as Ronald Reagan Day in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady... Representative Chapa LaVia, the Lady from Kane."
- Chapa LaVia: "Will the Sponsor yield? Why did... why did you pick February 6 as the day to honor President Ronald Reagan?"
- Franks: "Because February 6, 2007 was the 96th anniversary of Ronald Reagan's birth and the third since his passing."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harry Osterman. Out of the record. The

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

Black: "Speaker, in all seriousness, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, this is in statute. Do you still want to pursue your Resolution? This is in State Law."

Franks: "Yeah. There was an issue this year where they're trying to do a special one throughout the entire country and that's why we wanted to have this Resolution done to join the other states that were honoring Ronald Reagan this year."

Black: "All right. So, even though we have it in the law that we honor that date, you still want to pursue your Resolution?"

Franks: "That means we... we really mean it."

Black: "I... I know Ronald Reagan always spoke very highly of you and I appreciate you for doing this."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Resolution 55 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 55 is adopted. Representative Winters, you have House Resolution 71. Representative Winters in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative Meyer, you have House Resolution 96. Representative Jim Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It seems like from time to time we hear about the horror story of a returning veteran from a war zone coming back to the United States and their job, which is protected

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

by law, is not available to them. For whatever reason, the employer's chosen not to hold it open. At any rate, this... House Resolution 96 is very simple. It simply urges the Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs to inform employers of members of the armed forces who are called to active duty and the employment rights of those service members as veterans upon their return from active duty and to inform those employers of the consequences of not following the law in regard to the employment rights of returning veterans. I just ask for your support."

- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should the House Resolution be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 96 is hereby adopted. On the top of page 41 of the Calendar, Representative Poe has House Resolution 97. Representative Raymond Poe."
- Poe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker. This here Resolution would ask the Department of Central Management Services to report to the Department of Security to provide a monthly list of state job openings to the Department of Veterans' Affairs and the Department of Military Affairs."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Resolution 97 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 97 is adopted. House Resolution 109, Representative Bill Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If you're a baseball fan, whether you're a Cub fan or a Cardinal fan or a White Sox fan, I

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

hope you can support this Resolution. Number 10 in your program, number 1 in your heart, House Resolution 109 simply urges the Veterans' Committee of the Baseball Hall of Fame to elect Ron Santo to the Baseball Hall of Fame. Hey, hey, holy mackerel. Let's vote for this."

- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Resolution 109 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 109 passes... is adopted. Representative Tryon, you have House Resolution 115. Representative Mike Tryon."
- Tryon: "Yes. House Resolution 115 actually extends the life of the school impact fee task force that was created during the 93rd General Assembly. And we have actually been working as a committee and meeting and I think we are close to coming together with a document that we might be able to present in Bill language shortly. So, if there's any questions, I'd be glad to answer it."
- Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Should House Resolution 115 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunn. Representative Watson. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this… on this Resolution, there are 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And House Resolution 115 is hereby adopted. House Resolution 121, Representative Chapa LaVia."

the Midwest Shelter for Homeless Veterans, the new veteran's

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

home shelter, which opened within the last year in Wheaton, Illinois and was dedicated on January 20. It urges that the Veterans' Affairs department makes good on their promise and keeps on reimbursing them."

- Speaker Lyons: "Seeing that no one's seeking recognition, the question is, 'Should House Resolution 121 pass?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 121 is adopted. House Resolution 123, Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "I'm sorry. I've exceeded my allotment of Resolutions. No, I'm... Okay. This one is a very serious issue... they're all serious issues... but this one urges the Federal Government to meet all of its financial obligations of veterans' service from the GI Bill and subsequent laws. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "No one's seeking recognition, the question is, 'Should House Resolution 123 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 123 is adopted. Representative Will Davis, House Resolution 126."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 126 encourages the Department of Health Care and Family Services to reduce the financial and clinical burden of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease otherwise known as COPD by including this condition in its disease management and chronic care improvement plan. COPD also... commonly known as chronic bronchitis and emphysema is the fourth leading cause

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

of death in the United States and one of the top five that is rising in prevalence. It is a chronic progressive disease that impacts over 5.3 million (5,300,000) Illinois residents and 24 million (24,000,000) Americans. The annual cost to the nation was estimated to be about 37 billion dollars (\$37,000,000,000). Early diagnosis and management of COPD can effectively reduce the overall financial burden of the illness within public programs such as Medicaid. Proper management can lead to improved quality of life and self-sufficiency of patients and disease management has proven to be very cost effective. I ask for its adoption."

- Speaker Lyons: "Seeing as no one's seeking recognition, the question is, 'Should House Resolution 126 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 126 is hereby adopted. House Resolution 127, Representative Art Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I move for the adoption of House Resolution 127. It simply declares the week of February 25 through March 2, 2007 as the Illinois State Historical Society Markers Awareness Week in Illinois."
- Speaker Lyons: "All those in favor of the adoption of House Resolution 127 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 127 is adopted. Representative Acevedo, you have House Resolution 128. Representative Ed Acevedo."
- Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for adoption of House Resolution 128. It congratulates Harry W. Jones Jr. being

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

the Senior Lobbyist with the ComEd Legislative Strategies on his thirty-three (33) years of service."

- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Resolution 128 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 128 is hereby adopted. Representative Bob Molaro, you have House Resolution 134. Representative Bob Molaro."
- Molaro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This encourages and asks Congress to act on something that has been long overdue and that's the Social Security offset to government pensions. For those of you who don't know, who'll eventually be on government pension, you've also been paying into Social Security through other jobs or jobs that you had earlier in life, when you get your pension from government, Social Security takes an offset. Now, for maybe the employee... the employee himself it doesn't matter, but for your spouse, who may be living on very fixed income and they only get half of our pension, if it turns out that they do Social Security offset it really causes one heck of a burden for these people. So, we want to encourage Congress to act and eliminate that offset."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is... this recognition is seeked by Representative Will Davis. Representative Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. Very quickly, in one of my previous lives I served as am assistant to Congressman Jesse Jackson, Jr. and one of the case areas that I did in his office was Social Secur... was Social Security and I dealt with a lot of... a lot of our

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

constituents in the 2nd Congressional District that were affected by that offset provision. Many of them had worked for years and were... and were in two different pension systems and when it came time to apply for those pensions, one was offset by the other. So, if you worked and you... and you paid into those systems, you should be entitled to receive whatever's available to you. So, I do support your Resolution wholeheartedly in terms of eliminating this provision of the Social Security Administration. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Molaro."

Molaro: "Can... this is obviously is a serious Resolution. And I saw you laughing right in the middle of it, Sir. Do I... do I amuse you like a clown? I mean..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "Representative, I'm sorry. My colleague here in front of me made a... a comment that... that was... that was extremely jocular, so I wasn't laughing at your Resolution. And there's no need to take your jacket off; it's all good. No, I didn't call you a... I didn't call you that. No, not at all, Representative. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Resolution 134 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 134 is adopted. On top of page 42 is House Resolution 149. Representative Bob Pritchard. Representative Pritchard on House Resolution 149."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- Pritchard: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution recognizes those of us with Welsh heritage to have a day that we can celebrate and party and do all kinds of things that the Irish and others do. This would recognize the heritage and declare that March 1 of each year be recognized for those Welsh that have made a difference in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative John Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Inquiry of the Chair, Speaker. We seemed to have skipped over House Resolution 25. Was I gone? I apologize, Speaker."
- Speaker Lyons: "John, we did... we did call that, but you were missing in action at the time. We'll come back to that."
- Fritchey: "Hey, that tends to happen sometimes. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "We'll come back to that. No one else seeking recognition? Then the question is, 'Should House Resolution 149 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 149 is adopted. Representative Jack Franks, House Resolution 169 on the top of page 42. Representative Jack Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you. This Resolution honors actually my aunt, Helen Lindow. She received the award on March 10 through the Teachers Institute for the Women of Hebrew Theological College and they... I do have a conflict, but I'm stating it openly. Ask for the adoption."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Resolution 169 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

- have it. And House Resolution 169 is adopted. Back to page 40 of the Calendar, on the top of page 40, Representative Fritchey has House Resolution 20... Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 302, offered by Representative Cole. House Resolution 305, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 308, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Speaker Lyons: "All those in favor of passage of the Agreed Resolutions signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are hereby adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, the gold sheet was passed out here with the schedule for the remainder of the next two weeks and obviously, Monday has been canceled so take note of that. And seeing there's no further business is to come before the Illinois House of Representatives tonight, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Barbara Flynn Currie moves that the House adjourn to the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow, at Friday... Recognize Representative Bassi."
- Bassi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege.

 I just want to remind everybody, even though the hour is late, Room 118 for Capitol Capers. Be there or be square."
- Speaker Lyons: "And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Barbara Flynn Currie moves that the House stand adjourn to the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow, Friday, April 20. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen."

38th Legislative Day

4/19/2007

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative John Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 19, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' is House Bill 1724 and House Bill 3434; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is House Bill 315, House Bill 380, House Bill 410, House Bill 1040, House Bill 1263, House Bill 1449, House Bill 1985, and House Bill 3649. Introduction and reading of Senate Bills-First Reading. Senate Bill 649, offered by Representative Tracy, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 1208, offered by Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 1261, offered by Representative insurance. Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1324, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning stem cell research. Senate Bill 1305, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 1317, offered by Representative Holbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. First Reading of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."